

**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
MINUTES OF MEETING
MAY 13, 2010**

Town of Bedford
Bedford Town Hall
Lower Level Conference Room

PRESENT: Jeffrey Cohen, Chair; Herbert Aumann, Vice Chair; Brian Gildea, Clerk;
Jeffrey Dearing; Carol Amick

ABSENT: Robert Barton

BUSINESS MEETING:

At 7:15 PM, Mr. Cohen called a business session to order. He noted that Mara Briere, a resident at 267 Carlisle Road, is on the agenda for the May 27 Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) meeting due to some unfortunate and unusual circumstances. He said that she is here tonight to talk to the Board about her situation. Mr. Cohen explained to Ms. Briere that the Board cannot act on any application tonight, because it is bound by law to only hear an application after the agenda has been properly advertised for two consecutive weeks. He stated that he has put in a call to Town Counsel to find out whether the Board can somehow expedite the meeting or hear the application before the two consecutive advertisements have been met, but he has not heard back from them yet.

Ms. Briere introduced herself and said that her house was flooded on March 17 and the house was condemned by Christopher Laskey, the Code Enforcement Director, after the next storm. She said she has been out of the house since the first flood on March 17. She passed around a handout that included a timeline of all the entire crisis (see attachment). Ms. Briere briefly discussed each of the events listed in the timeline to give the Board a better understanding of the situation. She noted that the Conservation Commission granted her an emergency permit at last night's meeting so that she can at least get the Foundation Permit for the new home.

The Board talked with Ms. Briere about the details of the footings and placement of the new modular home.

Mr. Dearing asked the Chair why this application needs a Special Permit. Mr. Cohen replied that it is because the house will be built within a flood plain, and the Zoning By-Law has a section that requires a Special Permit for such construction.

Mr. Cohen said he will continue to see if there is any way the Board can move the hearing date up. He encouraged the other Board members to drive by the property to get a better understanding of the lot and the environment.

Ms. Briere thanked the Board for its time and willingness to meet early to discuss this situation.

Mr. Cohen read the emergency evacuation notice.

PRESENTATION: Mr. Gildea read the notice of the hearing.

PETITION #032-10 – SignWorks Group, for Acme Packet, at 100 Crosby Drive, seeks a Special Sign Permit per Article 40.4 Section 5(D) of the Sign By-Law to allow wall sign above second floor; per Article 40.5 Section 2(A) of the Sign By-Law to illuminate wall sign and freestanding sign; and to seek relief for oversized signage.

Jim Treacy, the applicant from SignWorks Group, introduced himself and introduced the owner of Acme Packet, who talked about the history of the company and noted that the company now employs over 500 people and hopes to add over a hundred more in the next year.

Mr. Treacy talked about the wall sign and pointed out that a rendering of the sign is included in the application packet. He said one reason they are before the Board tonight is to get a Special Permit to place the wall sign above the first floor of the building, because the company feels the sign would look awkward on the first floor. Mr. Treacy noted that the Board granted a Special Permit for a slightly larger wall sign above the second floor for the previous tenant, MRO Software. He explained that the other relief they need for the wall sign is a Special Permit to allow an increase of the sign up to 20% of the first floor wall area. Mr. Aumann asked what the area of the first floor wall is. Mr. Treacy said it is approximately 2000 square feet. Mr. Aumann said that the Board could then grant a sign up to 200 square feet, and this proposed sign is 129 square feet, so it meets the Sign By-Law's requirements.

Mr. Treacy talked about the illumination of the sign; he plugged in a sample letter to show how the backlit illumination would appear. He discussed the material of the sign and pointed out that the letters will be metal, each mounted on the wall individually.

The applicants discussed the freestanding sign. Mr. Treacy said that the sign is a size allowable by code, but they need a Special Permit for the sign for internal illumination. He pointed out that a color rendering of the sign is located in the application packet and said that the letters are acrylic push-through letters which are illuminated from the inside, giving it a similar "silhouette" look as the wall sign. Mr. Cohen said that he doesn't feel this illumination meets the Sign By-Law, as the By-Law strictly prohibits any internal illumination. Mr. Treacy said he thought he was before the Zoning Board specifically for internal illumination. Mr. Cohen replied that internal illumination is completely prohibited under the By-Law, but external illumination is allowed with a Special Permit from the Zoning Board; therefore, the Board can only grant external illumination.

Mr. Aumann asked whether the applicants had brought a catalogue cut of any other lighting fixtures. Mr. Treacy said he did not, because he did not realize that internal illumination wasn't allowed so he didn't have a back-up option.

Mr. Cohen said that the applicants would have to come back with a new option for the freestanding sign illumination. There was discussion about whether the Board should continue the entire hearing. The Board members agreed to vote on the wall sign, since all the documentation has been provided, and continue the hearing on the freestanding sign.

Mr. Cohen asked the Board members whether they were comfortable voting on just the wall sign tonight; Mr. Aumann said he was and said that the Board could close the public hearing now and re-open the public hearing for the freestanding sign at the next meeting.

Mr. Cohen opened the hearing to the public.

With no comments or questions from those in attendance, Mr. Cohen closed the public hearing for the wall sign.

DELIBERATIONS:

Mr. Aumann said the wall sign at this location is 129 square feet, and the Board could, under the Sign By-Law, grant up to 200 square feet, so he is comfortable with granting a Special Permit for that. He said there is a statement on the sign proposal that states the illumination is under 75 foot lamberts, and although he is not particularly happy with the way the statement is worded, he is still comfortable with the illumination. He added that the two conditions of a Special Permit are that the project is in keeping with the intent and purpose of the By-Law and is not injurious or detrimental to the neighborhood, and he believes this project meets those conditions. Mr. Cohen agreed, and noted that he has no problem voting in favor of this wall sign as long as the Board conditions the motion upon receipt of the foot lamberts letter.

MOTION:

Mr. Gildea moved to grant to SignWorks Group, for Acme Packet, at 100 Crosby Drive, a Special Sign Permit per Article 40.4 Section 5(D) of the Sign By-Law to allow wall sign above second floor and per Article 40.5 Section 2(A) of the Sign By-Law to illuminate wall sign, contingent on receipt of a certification letter stating that the illumination meets the 75 foot lamberts requirement of Sign By-Law. Sign may not be lit between the hours of 11 PM and 6 AM, per the Sign By-Law.

Mr. Aumann seconded the motion.

Mr. Cohen said he would like to have the clerk amend the motion to address the relief for oversized signage and to reference the exhibits.

AMENDED MOTION:

Mr. Gildea moved to amend prior motion to acknowledge that party is seeking relief per Article 40.4 Section 3(B) to permit oversized sign, substantially as shown on Exhibit A.

Mr. Aumann seconded the amended motion.

Voting in favor of amended motion: Cohen, Aumann, Gildea, Dearing, and Amick
Voting against: None
Abstained: None

Mr. Cohen explained that the Board has 14 days to write a decision, after which time there is a 20-day appeal period. The applicant is then responsible for getting the decision recorded at the Registry of Deeds. Once the decision is recorded, the applicant may apply for a Building Permit at the Code Enforcement Department.

Mr. Cohen said they will now continue the second part of the application, regarding the freestanding sign. He noted that the May 27 hearing is extremely busy with five applications, so he would like to continue this hearing to the following meeting. Mr. Dearing asked whether it would be worth holding this hearing at the next meeting, since it should be so quick. Mr. Cohen said he wasn't comfortable adding any more items to the next agenda and would prefer to put this off until June 10th.

MOTION:

Mr. Gildea moved to continue SignWorks Group, for Acme Packet, at 100 Crosby Drive, seeking a Special Sign Permit per Article 40.5 Section 2(A) of the Sign By-Law to illuminate freestanding sign, and seeking relief for oversized signage to June 10, 2010 at 7:30 PM.

Mr. Aumann seconded the motion.

Voting in favor: Cohen, Aumann, Gildea, Dearing, and Amick
Voting against: None
Abstained: None

The motion carried unanimously, 5-0-0

Mr. Cohen reread the emergency notice for those in attendance who had not heard the notice upon first reading.

PRESENTATION: Mr. Gildea read the notice of the hearing.

PETITION #030-10 – CONTINUATION – Shailesh Patel, for Bedford Plaza Hotel, at 340 Great Road, seeks to modify Special Permit #022-04 to split and illuminate wall

signs; seeks relief per Article 40.4 Section 2(B) of the Sign By-Law for oversized freestanding sign; and per Article 40.5 Section 2 to illuminate freestanding sign.

Mr. Cohen pointed out that this hearing is a continuation from the April 8 and April 22 meetings, for which the quorum is himself, Mr. Aumann, Mr. Gildea, and Mr. Dearing. He noted that Ms. Amick is welcome to engage in the discussion but may not vote.

Mr. Cohen stated that the applicants had been asked to come back with a plot plan showing where the freestanding sign is on the property; he asked whether they had done so. Mr. Patel greeted the Board, along with David Battcock, of Saco Signs. Mr. Patel showed the Board a plot plan that he had copied from the Building Department and pointed out approximately where the sign would be on the traffic island in front of the building.

Mr. Patel said he also brought light fixtures, provided by Baudanza Electric, that would be used to light the freestanding sign. He noted that this is the same fixture used at Old Town Hall and St. Michael's Church.

Mr. Aumann asked whether the applicants had provided any renderings of how the freestanding sign would look coming up from the side street, as the Board was anxious to know whether the sign would block sight lines. Mr. Patel said he did not have any renderings. There was discussion about the location of the freestanding sign on the island.

Mr. Cohen asked whether the applicants had a rendering of the freestanding sign they want to put on the island, to scale. Mr. Patel said he did not have such a drawing. Mr. Cohen said that the Board had asked for that at the last meeting and he is disappointed that it has not been provided.

The applicants discussed the wall signs. Mr. Patel said they originally proposed three wall signs but are now just proposing two. They talked about the size and aesthetics of the signs.

Mr. Aumann asked whether the brown covered-over sign would be removed. Mr. Patel said it would. Mr. Cohen said he would also like to see the remaining holes from the sign to be covered over. Mr. Patel assured him that it would be done and no trace of the sign would remain.

Mr. Cohen asked whether the applicants had provided the letter, which the Board had asked for at the last meeting, certifying that the sign illumination does not exceed 75 foot lamberts. Mr. Patel showed him some cut sheets that discuss foot lamberts, but he noted he doesn't have anything specific to these signs.

Mr. Dearing asked whether the illumination will be new or existing. Mr. Patel replied that they will use the existing lighting fixtures, which the Board had already approved several years ago. Mr. Aumann said he wasn't concerned about the foot lamberts

certification if the existing fixtures will be used.

Mr. Cohen opened the hearing to the public.

Donald Koundakjian, of 21 Independence Road, asked whether the people in attendance could see the signs. Mr. Patel handed him the sign renderings. Mr. Koundakjian thanked him.

Mr. Cohen asked Mr. Battcock to write the details of the sign materials and letter sizes on the exhibits and initial them for the ZBA records. Mr. Battcock did so.

Mr. Dearing asked whether the lights are currently on a timer. Mr. Patel responded that they are.

With no further comments from those in attendance, Mr. Cohen closed the public hearing.

DELIBERATIONS:

Mr. Aumann said the Board is now simply approving two wall signs. He stated the Board knows the dimensions and look of the signs, and the existing lighting fixtures will be re-used, so he is comfortable that he knows what he will be approving. He said that he would like to see a condition in the motion stating that the old sign will be taken down, but other than that one condition, he feels comfortable approving this sign. Mr. Cohen agreed, noting that the signs meet the two requirements of a Special Permit: they do not derogate from the intent and purpose of the By-Law and are not injurious or detrimental to the neighborhood. The other Board members indicated that they would have no problem voting in favor of these two signs.

MOTION:

Mr. Gildea moved to grant Shailesh Patel, for Bedford Plaza Hotel, at 340 Great Road, a Special Permit per Article 40.4 Section 3(A) to split wall signs and per Article 40.5 Section 2 to illuminate signs, substantially as shown on Exhibits A and B. Special Permit is contingent upon removal of the existing sign shown on Exhibit B; illumination will conform to the Sign By-Law and will not be lit between the hours of 11 PM and 6 AM.

Mr. Aumann seconded the motion.

Voting in favor: Cohen, Aumann, Gildea, and Dearing

Voting against: None

Abstained: None

The motion carried unanimously, 5-0-0.

Mr. Cohen explained that the Board has 14 days to write a decision, after which time there is a 20-day appeal period. The applicant is then responsible for getting the decision recorded at the Registry of Deeds. Once the decision is recorded, the applicant may apply for a Building Permit at the Code Enforcement Department.

PRESENTATION: Mr. Gildea read the notice of the hearing.

PETITION #031-10 – CONTINUATION – Bedford Sports Center, LLC, at 191 Hartwell Road, seeks a modification to Special Permit #025-07 to allow for single use alcohol permits for special events, per review of the Selectmen.

Brian DeVellis and Scott Fusco, managers and owners of The Edge Sports Center, greeted the Board and reminded the members that The Edge is a 70,000 square foot indoor sports center that is primarily used as a hockey and soccer facility. He explained that the Town and the owners were in a hurry to get the original Special Permit so they could construct this facility as quickly as possible, so the owners agreed to a condition of no alcohol on the premises. He continued that they never could have foreseen how popular this facility would become or the types of functions for which people would want to rent out the facility, and they have had numerous requests for special charity events or Bar Mitzvahs over the last year that they have had to turn down because of the no-alcohol condition. He said they are here this evening to request a modification to the Condition in the Special Permit that prohibits alcohol on the premises. They are not here seeking a liquor license for the facility, but rather to allow The Edge to appear before the Selectmen on an as-needed basis to apply for single-use alcohol permits for special events.

Mr. DeVellis pointed out that, in 2007, he met with the late Selectman Gordon Feltman and former ZBA Chair Robert Ellis to have an informal discussion regarding single use alcohol permits for the site, and both men were in favor of the idea. Mr. Cohen noted that he was also in attendance at the meeting just prior to the facility's grand opening. He noted he was not in favor of their request to allow alcohol on the premises for the players and their families following the charity game due to the timing of the request being so close to the issuance of the Special Permit.

Mr. DeVellis noted that he has also had requests for all-night events, such as after-prom party or school "lock-ins," but they have also been unable to accommodate those requests because of the Special Permit's condition that the premises will not be open any longer than 5:30 AM to 12 midnight. He asked whether it would the Board would be willing to entertain a discussion about the hours of operation tonight as well. Mr. Cohen said that the notice in the newspaper makes no mention of a discussion about the hours of operation, and he would feel uncomfortable talking about that tonight. He stated that he would rather keep the discussion limited to the alcohol permit.

Mr. Cohen asked whether any groups have *not* booked events because alcohol is not served on the property. Mr. DeVellis replied that they have had six or seven inquiries from various groups but none have booked an event yet, all because liquor is not allowed on the site.

Mr. Aumann said that when he read through the Board's original decision, he sees that there was a great deal of concern among not only the residents but also the Board in having alcohol at this site.

Mr. Dearing asked for confirmation that this modification will allow the applicants to petition the Selectmen for one-time-only liquor licenses. Mr. DeVellis said that is correct. Mr. Dearing said this sounds rather like the situation at Old Town Hall, which does not have a liquor license but where people/organizations wishing to rent the facility petition the Selectmen for alcohol permits for their event.

Ms. Amick asked whether the applicants have any letters or petitions from the neighbors supporting this application. Mr. DeVellis said they do not, but he believes that this meeting has been publicized enough that if the abutters had strong feelings against it, they would be here tonight (for the record, in addition to Mr. DeVellis and Mr. Fusco, there were only three other residents in attendance). He stated that he understood the concern of the neighbors was to keep out the notion of "men's league drinking" that could happen after hours in the parking lot or locker rooms, but he doesn't believe there was any voiced concern about one-time special events. He said that he firmly believes that those kinds of leagues do not practice or play at The Edge and he is frankly happy to not have them. He added that he hopes to continue with the kind of family-friendly atmosphere that the facility has nurtured thus far.

Mr. Cohen asked Walter St. Onge, Bedford Selectmen's liaison to the Zoning Board, what process applicants must go through to obtain a permit from the Selectmen for a one-time liquor license. Mr. St. Onge replied that there is a standard application form that must be filled out and a proof of insurance must be provided. He noted that a set of rules and regulations must also be read and the applicant must assure the Selectmen that they have read these guidelines and will adhere to them.

Mr. Gildea said that he would feel more comfortable knowing that the people catering the event would bring the alcohol themselves and then remove it themselves, preferably the same day; he suggested a condition stating this. The other Board members said they were amenable to such a condition. Mr. DeVellis stated that The Edge would not store alcohol on the premises.

There was discussion about the insurance carried by the applicants and the caterers. Mr. DeVellis pointed out that The Edge is insured and will take responsibility of the insurance for the alcohol for any given event.

Ms. Amick asked whether the applicants have any estimation about how often these events would occur or what days of the week they would occur on. Mr. DeVellis responded that he can't say for certain, but he imagines that there will be approximately four to six per year; he said they would most often be held during the off-season, from April through June, but could conceivably be held any time during the year. The Board expressed a concern for the number of events that could be scheduled given how popular

the facility has become and asked Mr. St. Onge how the Selectmen might view this situation. Mr. St. Onge said that the permit is for single-use events and the Selectmen would be aware if the number of events became so frequent that it appeared as though the Edge were being granted a back-door liquor license.

Mr. Cohen opened the hearing to the public.

Angelo Colasante, of 2 Old Stagecoach Road, said that he is familiar with The Edge and thinks it is a great facility. He said that he personally does not have any problem with this type of permit, since it will only be for specialized events, but was curious as to how the process would actually work. He explained that his only real concern is that groups would come to The Edge only days or weeks before an event and then try to rush through the application process, overlooking some safety guidelines. Mr. DeVellis said he can't envision people coming to The Edge and wanting an event the next weekend, and he would be comfortable with a condition stating that groups must apply to The Edge a certain amount of time ahead of the event, either weeks or even months. Mr. St. Onge noted that the individuals would have to appear before the Selectmen at one of their bi-weekly meetings, which requires some forethought and planning in advance.

Mr. Dearing asked whether the applicants have any information on the area abutting the sports center that used to be the mobile home park. Mr. DeVellis replied that Massport owns it and it is under lease to Hanscom Airforce Base until 2020.

Donald Koundakjian, of 21 Independence Road, said he is not technically an abutter to this property but does live in the neighborhood. He asked whether The Edge Sports Center would have to be here tonight if the ZBA's Special Permit had never mentioned anything about alcohol. After discussion, Mr. Cohen concluded that The Edge would not have had to come to the Zoning Board for this permission; the facility would only have to apply on an as-needed basis to the Selectmen for the single-use alcohol permit. They are here to night to request a modification the Condition in the Special Permit.

Mr. Koundakjian said that he has never seen anything other than decent behavior from the people at The Edge, so he has no indication that drinking on the premises would ever get out of hand. He added that he knows Mr. DeVellis and Mr. Fusco have worked hard to be good neighbors to the Town of Bedford, so he is sure they would not want to jeopardize that hard work by pushing events through quickly or letting events get out of hand.

Mr. Cohen asked whether the Board of Selectmen has a position on The Edge's alcohol proposal. Mr. St. Onge said they have not talked about it so he cannot speak for the Board.

Mr. Aumann suggested a condition stating that no other events may occur at the facility while an alcohol-related event is going on. Mr. DeVellis said he can appreciate where Mr. Aumann is coming from, but he isn't sure whether that is possible. He noted that, for example, The Edge leases space to a physical fitness company, and he would feel very

uncomfortable asking them to shut down their program just because an event where alcohol is being served is in progress. Mr. Amick said she would be uncomfortable knowing that other events are going on when there is alcohol available in the building. She suggested having some sort of segregation of the alcohol-related event from the rest of the building. Mr. Cohen said that perhaps the applicants could submit a “segregation plan” with the application packet to the Selectmen that shows how the event will be roped off or sealed off from the rest of the facility. Mr. DeVellis said he would be amenable to that.

Ms. Amick said that she would like to make The Edge be responsible for ensuring that the segregation plan is adhered to, and not a catering company. Mr. DeVellis said he would be willing to take that responsibility, but there is only so much their staff can do. He believes the servers are more capable of policing the events to be sure the alcohol stays within the segregated area.

There was discussion about the staffing of events with alcohol.

Mr. Koundakjian asked Mr. St. Onge whether the Board of Selectmen has ever been informed of an event with alcohol that got out of hand. Mr. St. Onge said he is not aware of any, but stressed that he has only been on the Selectmen for a year so he can't say that it has never happened.

Mr. Cohen suggested having some signage around the segregated area so that people know not to enter the sections with alcohol and the people inside the area know not to take alcohol out of it.

Mr. Gildea asked whether the Board wanted to put a condition in the motion about police detail. Mr. Cohen said such a condition might be restrictive and he believes the Police Department will send a detail on an as-needed basis. Mr. St. Onge noted that the application to the Selectmen includes a review by the Police Department.

With no further comments from those in attendance, Mr. Cohen closed the public hearing.

DELIBERATIONS:

Mr. Cohen said that the original Special Permit clearly prohibited alcohol on the premises, so if the Board members are going to vote in favor of this one-time alcohol permit, they should strike the original condition and replace it with a new condition. Mr. Aumann disagreed and stated that the original language should remain and be amended to read, “with the following exceptions...” Mr. Cohen agreed with this approach.

The Board members all agreed that it is important to segregate the area where alcohol would be served from other activities at the Edge and keep the alcohol within the segregated area. The Board members discussed each of the conditions that they wanted to include in the motion: that alcohol will be brought to the premises on the day of the event

and taken away before the facility opened the next business day; that the application to the Selectmen must include an alcohol segregation floor plan; and internal signage will be put up at the site to ensure that people know where they may or may not go with alcohol.

Mr. Cohen said he believes the Board has been thorough tonight in examining the concerns of the neighbors and the Town and balancing that with the applicant's request in recognition of the changing usage of the facility. He believes that a modification to the original Special Permit with new conditions would be reasonable.

Mr. Aumann said that he feels comfortable with these conditions and this modification, especially because the Selectmen will have the final say so the Town has a measure of "checks and balances" with this Special Permit modification; the Board will not simply be allowing The Edge to obtain a liquor license for any event without some say by the Selectmen. The other Board members indicated that they were comfortable with this modification and conditions, as well.

MOTION:

Mr. Gildea moved to grant a modification to Condition No. 2 of Special Permit #025-07 to allow for single-use alcohol permits for special events subject to the following four conditions: 1) Serving of alcohol at all special events will be permitted by approval of the Board of Selectmen through the issuance of a one-day or special alcohol and beverage license; 2) All alcohol will be brought to facility on the day of the event and shall be removed from facility before the facility opens again on next business day; 3) Alcohol permit application to the Selectmen from The Edge must include a floor plan illustrating the segregation of areas where the serving and consumption of alcohol occurs from other areas in the facility, or contain a statement that The Edge shall see to it that no other events will be taking place at the facility during the event where alcohol is being served; 4) There shall be posted temporary internal signage during the special event to show where alcohol is permitted and where it is prohibited; said language to be added to Condition No. 2, following the last sentence of Condition No. 2.

Mr. Aumann seconded the motion.

Voting in favor: Cohen, Aumann, Gildea, Dearing, and Amick

Voting against: None

Abstained: None

Mr. Cohen explained that the Board has 14 days to write a decision, after which time there is a 20-day appeal period. The applicant is then responsible for having the decision recorded at the Registry of Deeds. Once the decision is recorded, the applicant may apply for single-use alcohol permits with the Board of Selectmen for special events at The Edge.

PRESENTATION: Mr. Gildea read the notice of the hearing.

PETITION #028-10 – CONTINUATION – William Waite, Jr., for Right at Home, 60 Great Road, seeks a Special Permit per Article 40.5 Section 2(A) of the Sign By-Law to illuminate wall sign.

Mr. Cohen explained that Mr. Waite has written a letter to the Board asking to withdraw his petition without prejudice. He read the letter, dated May 13, 2010.

MOTION:

Mr. Aumann moved to withdraw without prejudice the application of William Waite, Jr., for Right at Home, 60 Great Road, seeking a Special Permit per Article 40.5 Section 2(A) of the Sign By-Law to illuminate wall sign.

Ms. Amick seconded the motion.

Voting in favor: Cohen, Aumann, Gildea, Dearing, and Amick

Voting against: None

Abstained: None

The motion carried unanimously, 5-0-0.

MOTION:

Mr. Gildea move to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Dearing seconded the motion.

Voting in favor: Cohen, Aumann, Gildea, Dearing, and Amick

Voting against: None

Abstained: None

The meeting adjourned at 9:40 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Scott Gould
Zoning Board Assistant

Attachments:

- Timeline packet from Mara Briere, of 267 Carlisle Road
- Letter of withdrawal from William Waite, Jr., dated May 13, 2010

Zoning Board of Appeals
Minutes of Meeting 5-13-10