

TOWN OF KINGSTON
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

MINUTES
May 4, 2022

Members

Paul Dahlen – Chairman
Doug Dondero – Vice Chairman
Lane Goldberg
Robert Mullen
Kevin Wrightington

Mr. Dahlen called to order the meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals at 7:02 pm in Room 200, Mr. Dondero motioned to open the meeting and Mr. Goldberg seconded. Also, in Room 200: Mr. Mullen with a vote of 5-0-0.

VOTE: 5-0-0 to open the Zoning Board of Appeals Hearing.

7:05 PM In accordance with MGL 40A, §8. A public hearing will be held to hear the appeal of the zoning enforcement officers actions taken on zoning complaints dated June 24, 2021, September 13, 2021, and September 27, 2021. Submitted by the Zifcak's alleging 33 Brook Street of zoning violations.

Jason Silva, Building Commissioner, Zoning Enforcement, stated at the conclusion of the last hearing the intent was to provide a draft decision. That's what we have done. In speaking with town counsel, Attorney Brian Winner, he drafted a decision based on the information provided from the last hearing. He listened to the content of the discussion as well as looked through the file of information. That decision is in front of you. We have Attorney Mike Kennefick tonight to speak to the decision so that the Board can if they choose to modify the decision, alter, and speak to the legality behind the decision if needed. If you read through the decision, it is in keeping with what was discussed. If you have any questions, you can address those to myself or Mike.

Mr. Dahlen asked if Attorney Kennefick would give a synopsis of the decision.

Attorney Kennefick proceeded with a synopsis of the decision. He mentioned that the first two pages are procedural and background history. The important part to focus on is page three which would be determination and decisions. Understanding is that the property owners that are the subject of the complaint sold their house and animals removed. There are two findings with number two, subsection A and subsection B. The first and perhaps the most important one that finding is that the appeal is essentially moot because the animals have been removed and the property owner does not own the house anymore. We had a discussion with the building inspector, and he thinks it is important the ZBA supports Jason's decision that these animals in this case and circumstances this is not an activity that is regulated by any of the town's bylaws. This is just a small of animals that were purchased as pets and

not breeding. Kingston is a relatively rural town. It is not uncommon to see people in town keeping chickens. Jason's belief is that he wants support behind the decision that he made.

Mr. Dahlen stating that it is not a decision per say but we're upholding the decision of the Zoning Enforcer.

Attorney Kennefick stated that he didn't believe an appeal could be taken because the complaining party at this point doesn't have any standing. Second finding would be basically a statement of support of the decision of the Building Inspector.

Mr. Goldberg stated that once he found out that the animals were not on the premises it was moot.

Mr. Silva stated that there was an option discussed that the Board could vote on the individual items within it. In turn the decision can reflect each individual members feeling on those two points. For example, 5-0 on moot point or 4-1 on the decision. You have those options and that is why Attorney Kennefick is here.

Mr. Goldberg stated that he is not saying yes or no to number two. Mr. Goldberg is stating that he had looked before the hearing but didn't go into any testimony and come to a decision as to whether Mr. Silva is right or wrong.

Mr. Dondero questioned whether the actions tonight prevent nightmares like this happening in the future.

Mr. Dahlen stated no.

Mr. Goldberg stated that the Town has to amend the bylaw.

Mr. Dahlen agreed with Mr. Goldberg.

Mr. Silva agreed with Mr. Goldberg.

Mr. Dahlen stated that Mr. Silva is looking for reasoning as to why he came to the determination that he did so that if someone has to look at this in two years, on an appeal, they don't just look at it as a moot point. It will show Jason's actions as to why he came to the decision.

Mr. Goldberg directed a question to Attorney Kennefick asking the court will decide if it is moot and not decide it on the merits. Mr. Goldberg stated that he is not deciding on the merits but saying this is moot because the animals are gone and there's no complaint. Mr. Goldberg asked Mr. Kennefick if he is correct in looking at it that way.

Attorney Kennefick replied yes. Important finding is that it is moot. The Building Inspector was looking for an expression of support for his position because whenever there is an appeal like this in the 40A one of the first things that an attorney is going to do is look at other relevant cases in town that are

closely related to the issue they're raising in court. It is not binding It would be an expression of support and something to establish a record if something else comes up like this in the future.

Mr. Silva stated that is exactly what is being asked of the Board. That is why the context has been brought to you and how the conclusions were made in this particular case as well as how much time, effort and knowledge went into these decisions. That is why the Board is being asked not in the broadest sense of the bylaw but in this particular case come to the conclusion in support of Jason's decision because again a thorough, deep amount of research has been put into these questions including several to Town Counsel to come to these decisions. If you don't support that decision is the Board's choice but you have given the opportunity for people to continue to argue in front of this Board the exact same question over again. At some point a decision will be made by the Board as to whether having a few chickens and having a few animals that you label as pets is customary incidental to a single-family dwelling. That would clearly be a deep argument to be made. That argument may be best made in front of Town Meeting. In this case under 40a it is an appeal of a very specific circumstance. You don't have to agree that it's the best choice but that we made the right decision based upon the information, rules laws & regulations that we have at this time.

Mr. Goldberg read and offered that Mr. Silva made a reasonable and well-grounded decision based on the zoning bylaw. Mr. Goldberg would be comfortable with the first part of 'A' and striking the second sentence and maybe rewording 'B' because we are affirming Jason's interpretation of the bylaw.

Mr. Silva stated the important takeaway is certainly the interpretation in this case not the interpretation of the entire bylaw. Based on the bylaw and the specific circumstances of 33 Brook St. these were the right conclusions to make. Given another complaint on another property could come to a completely different conclusion based on a whole different set of facts. It provides clarity to me that Jason should continue when these types of situations arise to follow through in a similar position.

Mr. Goldberg asked if the Board is voting on Mr. Silva's method and not the actual outcome, how you determined that and if it was reasonable. Maybe that's a question for the Attorney.

Mr. Silva stated that he approached these is what's the question, what action if any is to be taken and move forward from there. The answer was no to action to be taken and the answer is no. Could not go on to take any enforcement action. The question is, is this a legitimate complaint. Is there something in violation of the bylaw and the answer is no.

Mr. Goldberg agreed that Mr. Silva did that perfectly well. Are we voting on Mr. Silva's method or the outcome of the decision under the bylaw?

Mr. Silva continued to give the Board context. On April 11, 2022, the Lally family filed another complaint in the Building Department against 37 Brook St. for having chickens and a rooster. Mr. Silva's response on April 11th and April 12, 2022, was that no action would be taken on their complaint. They are aware and a party to this case. The direction the Board is taking is that there will be no action taken on 33 Brook St. You call this basically moot. The Lally family could file another complaint and another appeal to the decision and could be right back in front of the ZBA in 30 days with essentially the same situation.

Mr. Silva explained as Building Commissioner he has no direction if the Board does not make a decision on this. Zoning Board of Appeals is the backstop and support. If the ZBA is not willing to make some conclusions as to how we are to enforce these rules and regulations, then who is. Was the right thing done or was the wrong thing done? Mr. Silva doesn't want this to be a precedent or interpretation of the bylaw otherwise. It's just support of one decision on an appeal.

Mrs. Zifack, 35 Brook St., questioned the appeal being moot and nullifying it and stated that statistically there are 32 households out of 2,700 that have these type of animals, livestock, nondomestic animals. Zifcak's don't look at that as being customary. Has the ZBA affirmed Mr. Silva's decision?

Mr. Dahlen replied that the Board has not done anything yet. We are deciding the decision.

Mr. Dahlen stated that as a Board the determination needs to be made as to whether we are done with this one time as a moot point or do we work on this more, so this doesn't happen on every street.

Mr. Silva stated that he received another complaint on another residence by the Lally's. They went through the Selectmen's Office and the Town Administrator's Office. Mr. Silva responded on the complaint and told them that Mr. Silva would take no action on the complaint given the direction that the Board was taking, Mr. Silva felt as though they would be affirming, not affirmed, but affirming the decision that Mr. Silva made based on the information. Mr. Silva stated that he would not put out a decision until a decision exists from the ZBA. Mr. Silva needed a basis to respond to their second complaint which was the next neighbor. Based on the information of the first complaint and the current case that no action would be taken on the complaint. They're looking to use these complaints to take action on abutters or to have Mr. Silva take action on abutters. It is not appropriate based on the regulations. Mr. Silva stated that he does not have any personal issues or relationships with people who own these types of animals and does not live in Kingston. Mr. Silva stated that he takes his role seriously about enforcing the rules and regulations. The town as a body should make whatever rules are appropriate. Mr. Silva will enforce whatever they are.

Mr. Goldberg asked Mr. Silva under what section of the bylaw are you interpreting your decision?

Mr. Silva stated that there's no interpretation of any bylaw at all.

Mr. Goldberg asked why the Board is looking at this?

Mr. Silva stated that 40a section 8 allows for an appeal of a building officials decision meaning if they feel aggrieved that either action or nonaction they can appeal that to this Board. Either yes, the Building Commissioner made the right decision or no he did not. That is the important takeaway. ZBA is not interpreting the bylaw or definition on words. This is what Mr. Silva is making sure goes to town meeting. If the ZBA does not provide clarity in leaves everything ambiguous. So the resident can look at the word in a bylaw and come up with their own definition.

Mr. Goldberg stated that Mr. Silva took the correct steps. Mr. Silva's determination was reasonable and well grounded.

Mr. Dahlen pooled the Board.

Mr. Dondero stated that he supports Mr. Silva the Building Inspector, the way he came about it and the fact that Town Counsel is supporting it as well.

Mr. Goldberg stated that he is saying the same thing but he didn't make the determination of whether under the bylaw they met their burden or not.

Mr. Wrightington agrees with Mr. Silva and supports his decision. The animals are not there. It's not commercial, it's residential. If the new neighbors want a goat or chickens there's five acres of land there. We cannot just change a decision on one piece of property because somebody else doesn't like it.

Mr. Mullen stated that Mr. Silva interpreted properly. From Town regulations this should go to the Town Planning Board for a longer discussion.

Donna Zifcak, 35 Brook St. there's regulations in the bylaw that in an R20 zone to have noncommercial livestock or poultry. You need a special permit.

Mr. Goldberg stated that he did not believe that Mr. Silva was saying that. Mr. Silva was saying that there is nothing in the bylaw that guides the Board to interpret this.

Mr. Dahlen stated that all the Board is doing in this upholding or going against Mr. Silva's decision.

Mr. Silva stated that the R20 zoning that is in the bylaw requires a special permit is for principal uses. That was discussed with Town Counsel. In the bylaw the way it is written in the Town of Kingston uses in an R20 zone is for principal use. There's nothing else on the lot. This is incidental customary. Is having this level of animal's incidental subordinate to normal in the Town of Kingston. Areas in town in the R20 zone that doesn't have a principal use on it that wants to have some animals on it would have to apply to the town for a special permit.

Mr. Zifcak, 35 Brook St. stated that he has an email from Attorney Brian Winter and underlined part of the email which was given to Mr. Dahlen.

Mr. Dahlen proceeded to read the email.

Mr. Goldberg stated that the Board is only affirming that Mr. Silva made the right decision.

George Zifcak stated that the decision dovetails with the right to farm, which Kingston is a right to farm community. R40 and R80 is a permitted use to have livestock and poultry which is clearly marked on the zoning schedule. R20 specifically says that it is not permitted. You're taking something and saying it is an accessory use, whoever, according to the schedule it is not permitted. There were violations sent out prior.

Mr. Dahlen asked Mr. Silva if there was something wrong with the scheduling such as a Scribner's error?

Mr. Silva stated there is a way of addressing the complaints. The complaints get forwarded to the person telling them they are in violation. This creates a response. A determination cannot be made until a response is received. The response is compared to the complaint and come up with the conclusion.

Mr. Dahlen stated that it could be taken above the Board's head to the town. Right now, it is very gray. Right now, we are making a decision on a moot point.

Mr. Dahlen asked Attorney Kennefick to explain a little more.

Attorney Kennefick stated that the Building Inspector is also the town's Zoning Enforcement Officer. Mr. Silva is the Board's gatekeeper. Complaints are directed through Mr. Silva's office and then he does an investigation. Someone thought he had come to an initial determination that this was a zoning violation. In this case he did an investigation like he is required to do under 40A. He determined that these animals were being kept as pets. The primary use of this property is as a residential lot. The primary use is what controls zoning permits. If the primary use is permissible, anything that is related or incidental to that primary use is not subject to zoning. It's not subject to regulation in any way whatsoever. It does not matter what the zoning bylaws say. As long as it is incidental to primary use that's lawful as well. A lot of the things that are being brought up here about the regulation and the bylaw, most of those bylaws are in place because you're talking about situations where either that would be the primary use itself. Growing of livestock would be considered a primary use or a secondary in a completely unrelated use.

Mr. Dahlen reviewed and went over the draft decision with the Board and the Building Commissioner, Mr. Jason Silva. (See Final Decision).

Motion: Mr. Dondero motioned to **approve the corrections on the decision as amended**, seconded by Mr. Wrightington with a vote of 5-0-0.

VOTE: 5-0-0 to approve the corrections on the decision as amended.

Appointment:

7:10 PM Applicant must seek a special permit from the Zoning Board of Appeals per section 5.2 table of uses in order to construct and run a dog daycare business and boarding of dogs. Caitlin Anderson, 114R Main Street, Map 58, Lot 132. Continued from March 2, 2022, and March 16, 2022, April 6, 2022.

Mr. Goldberg asked Caitlin Anderson if she passed out new information to the abutters.

Caitlin Anderson stated that she had one extra copy of the sound proofing information.

Mr. Dahlen stated that the Board left off with parking and the back of the of the building pertaining to noise.

Caitlin Anderson stated that instead of doing the vinyl fencing outside at the perimeter we plan to do a wood fence. Looking over the best sound proofing options. Wood would absorb some the sound. The Anderson's looked into mass loaded vinyl which is like a heavy-duty sheet that gets installed to the inside of the fencing so it will only be visible to anyone inside the play area. It wouldn't be an eye sore. This absorbs 50-60% of the sound. It is safe to be in the sun and wouldn't do anything to tarnish it. Inside each play lot we would be installing an ultrasonic dog silencer. Silencers cover up to 300' with a high pitch sound. Only dogs can hear the high pitch sound to distract them. When dogs are supervised, they're not barking excessively because they are preoccupied with playing. None of the dogs would be left unattended. In the middle of the packet shows reviews by people who used this product and their success with it. The back page shows a petition from people in surrounding towns including Kingston that this building and business use would be an asset.

Mr. Dahlen stated that he drove by the property and drove around the back of the building, and it is very tight and had difficulty making the turn. Biggest concern is the back of the building.

Caitlin Anderson stated that when she talked to the Fire Department and for trash, they didn't need full access to get to the back. Trash is already preexisting where it is. The Fire Department did ask that to the side of the building where the triangle fenced lot is that there be an emergency exit in the event of a fire. Two doors are needed. Nobody would be driving around the building, only the sides. Trash route is on the right side of the building.

Mr. Dahlen asked Mr. Silva if the Anderson's could put an 8' or 10' fence outside or is that too tall? What's the limitations? Mr. Dahlen's reasoning is that a higher fence would lower the sound.

Mr. Silva stated that standard fencing is 6'. 8' fencing requires a building permit for structural. Any fence over 6' is a giant wind catch and could go over and somebody could get hurt. It would need to be designed by an engineer to be done properly so that it doesn't fall over.

Mr. Dahlen told Caitlin Anderson that they just want her to do it right.

Caitlin Anderson said that she understood.

Mr. Dahlen asked if anyone from the public would like to speak.

Paul Vantangoli, 5 Brightside Ave. Have been in his home since 1985. Expressed concern over the noise, hours of operation and existing fence in need of repair. If there is a noise problem, the building department will be visited all the time. Just wants to be sure their neighborhood is not impacted negatively.

Mr. Dahlen stated that regulations are tight through the Animal Control Officer. If the back neighbors were not so close, then this would be done.

Mr. Vantangoli asked the Board to not go forward with this.

Kelly Conte, 7 Brightside Ave. expressed concern over the potential noise. The area outside is too close. Concerned about getting sleep during the day as she works at night.

Tree Kuharich, 5 Post Court agrees with the neighbors. Expressed concern over how close the facility is to abutters and the traffic pattern. With the Daycare for children right across the street which will have very similar hours to the dog daycare. There's a quarter mile stretch on 3A with two to three hundred homes that are impacted by this traffic pattern. Tree stated that the noise and traffic is a problem. This is not the location for this business. Tree urges the board not to accept this.

John Hajaar, Landlord at 114R Main St. asked to bear in mind that this is a state highway. Explained that he has a tenant in Hingham that owns a dog daycare, and he has had no problems, not even one complaint. Feels that there is less noise from this considering other businesses that could go into this space without a special permit. Does not think this business would be a nuisance.

Mr. Dahlen asked that Mr. Hajaar stay at the podium. Mr. Hajaar was asked about the trapezoid that goes up over the retention pond which is surrounded by a chain link fence.

Mr. Hajaar stated that he hasn't studied the property line and was not sure about the fence.

Mr. Dahlen suggested an Arborvitae row for sound absorption and gets rid of line of vision to the back of the building. The building needs a buffer. This would be putting up another layer of defense.

Mr. Hajaar agreed on the greenery in the back and suggested not going from 6-8' on the fence as it would be unsightly and costly.

Mr. Dahlen stated that there can be conditions put on this decision. Talked to Caitlin Anderson about whether she is willing to spend the money needed to get to where she needs to.

Caitlin Anderson stated that as for the traffic, it's a main road. As for the sound, they are open to the 8' fence. They have gone through the process enough and provided all the information required. A petition is going around with currently 130 signatures on it and more online today. They are all for the purple building and people that would use the business. With it being next to the highway it makes it easy. The noise during the day is understood, however if the noise is the problem the mass loaded vinyl will absorb most of the sound which is on the inside. Also open to the Arborvitaes. Agrees to whatever would be compliant at this point.

Kelly Conte feels like the landlord is threatening the neighbors with what could legally go in there. The property has been vacant for X number of years. Wants the peace that taxes pay for. This is not the place for this business.

Mr. Dahlen told Ms. Conte that the conditions stay in effect as long as the dog daycare is in business. It is the landlord and business owners' responsibility to take care of the Arborvitaes.

Caitlin Anderson's idea for the outside use is less dogs at a time outside would be easier to monitor. Plan is to have groups of five dogs at a time going outside and rotate them for 1 ½ hours in the morning and afternoon before closing. Caitlin was open to a certain time frame in the morning. Primarily the dogs will be playing indoors. Indoors is a climate-controlled environment which they are specializing in.

Mr. Vantangoli spoke of the "back Yard" that Kelly Conte was referring to. He believes that the fence should be repaired, Arborvitaes and sound barrier on the building would help.

Mr. Hajaar is happy to meet the neighbors with tenant and walk the property. The last thing that Caitlin wants to do is create a nuisance for anybody.

Mr. Dahlen told the owner, Mr. Hajaar that if he is going to budget for building, he has to budget for the outside of the building too.

Andy Davis via Zoom, 11 Crystal Drive speaking about the dog park – Boneyard under the turbine and with approximately 20 dogs running around and playing there is not a lot of dog barking if any at all. Suggested that people may want to go up and observe the dog bark and see that there is not a lot of noise.

Susan Sherman, 215 Main Street, feels that we should stand with the residents and protect their investment. Does not think the location of 114R Main St. is the right place for this business but a great service and idea. Concerned about the traffic also.

Nathan Hedberg, 10 Post Court, is not convinced that the soundproofing will have a significant impact. Questioned the recourse if there were a problem. Indoor barking could emanate from the building and could be disturbing. Looking at the list of names on the petition a lot them are not from Kingston.

Mr. Dahlen stated that the recourse would be that if after one year it was a nuisance, they would not be able to advance to the next level which would be boarding. The names of the list from different towns are not an issue. Traffic is already there.

Mr. Mullen stated that no matter what goes in there we cannot control the traffic. It's 3A and a busy road. Whether the building stays vacant, or someone occupied it, the traffic is still going to be bad. The Andersons are trying to control the noise. Empathizes with the neighbors because no one likes to hear a dog bark. It sounds like the Andersons are trying to do everything they can to control the noise.

Mr. Wrightington stated that the Andersons have done their homework as far as this goes. Feels for the neighbors. Next year the Andersons will want to be back for boarding dogs. Brought up drainage.

Kelly Conte, Brightside Avenue, in the divot behind the ground bank there is a vernal pond so if they are spraying anything off it will go into the vernal pond that goes into water running into the bay. We don't want anything going into the ocean that shouldn't be.

Mr. Hajaar, Caitlin Anderson has a tight protocol to clean up after the dogs.

Caitlin Anderson works in an animal hospital and what they use to clean up after the dogs is dish soap which is safe for the environment. It states that on the sheet that was handed out.

M., Dondero stated that he advocates for the neighbors. Business plan is excellent. The company would be an asset to Kingston. Wants Caitlin's business to be successful and not have to put too many stipulations on it. Encourages the Andersons to find another location in town.

Mr. Goldberg expressed concern that the use does not adversely affect the neighborhood. All are speculating on whether the dogs are going to bark. There is no play area outside.

Caitlin Anderson explained to the Board that with the requirements in order to run a dog daycare the want you to have a designated area for dogs to go to the bathroom. In order to operate with 25 dogs even though the Animal Control Officer gave authorization for 50 dogs. To get to the number they needed the square footage outdoors. Indoors is for playing and outdoors is strictly to go to the bathroom.

Burt Anderson works in HVAC and works in buildings in Boston and other areas that house dogs all the time. If you stand outside on Causeway Street, you can't hear a peep from a dog.

Mr. Dahlen stated that the Board needs to take into consideration people in the area that do not have dogs or do not like dogs. The issue is the back left side of the building. That is what we are trying to correct.

Burt Anderson suggested that the area be to the right of the building and move the dumpster which avoid the whole back area.

Mr. Hajaar stated that the grade is higher on the right side of the building which works as a natural barrier.

Mr. Dahlen stated that if the neighbors do not feel that they are being protected enough then the Board has to make a decision.

Caitlin Anderson stated that they would be cutting down on the number of dogs.

Mr. Dahlen stated he would be find with moving forward and asked about conditions.

Mr. Goldberg stated that would be fine on a condition of a certain number of dogs, higher fence, and sound barrier. Does not think it will adversely affect the neighborhood.

Caitlin Anderson added that the dogs that are going to be in dog daycare are either new dogs being introduced in and will go through a screening to make sure that they are safe to be with other dogs or it's dogs that have already been in dog daycare. They know how it operates. They're well-behaved dogs. Will not be getting dogs that are aggressive or doing a boarding facility just yet. Primarily just focusing on doing a dog daycare to get started. If all goes well in a year, then would take that up with the Animal Control Officer. Needed to present everything at first, at hand so that the Board was aware.

Mr. Dahlen stated to Caitlin that he was going to pool the Board to attempt to move forward with conditions or have it on paper to see what is okay with the Animal Control Officer and Zoning Enforcer.

Caitlin Anderson added that anything on the exterior of the building has to go back through the site plan approval process through the Town Planning Board to get it approved and will have to start over again.

Mr. Silva, Enforcement Officer stated that in regard to the site plan, the site plan review is done by the Planning Board. It's essentially an advisory position. The ZBA can change it and do not need to refer them back. You're only required to do site plan once. These issues can come back such as noise issue, traffic which could be caused by some sort of professional office with traffic coming at different times during the day. Traffic is not to the obligation of this tenant to deal with. Noise is legitimate and real. Applicant is willing to adjust the plans. Offering of plantings as revised, plans showing how big outside area is. A great way of controlling the noise is to move the location to as far away from the residents as possible. Conditioning the number of dogs outside at one time. That can be on a timing schedule. The Board can find what works based on the neighbors' concerns. Condition the permit so that the noise is attenuated during the worst or most concerning times by eliminating the number of dogs outside and that is definitely a good idea. That can be written into the decision easy enough. Regarding the 8' fencing, has some sound barrier product built into it. It can be a very expensive product but can be effective. The Board can adjust the plan accordingly with what the appropriate concerns are of abutters. The Board is close and what those exact items are is up to the applicant to offer up. If the Board agrees with those then put them into the decision as conditions.

Mr. Dahlen spoke of fencing, no play area on outside of building and leash only when dogs are brought outside. That way there's no leaving dogs unattended. Are they required to have a fenced in area.

Mr. Goldberg questioned whether the Animal Control Officer requires an outdoor area.

Caitlin Anderson believes that it is the Selectman's Office that requires it.

Mr. Silva stated that it is a general bylaw dog kenneling regulation. kennel license. How much is waivable is up to selectman. They have a right to look at the ZBA decision. They could waive the kennel license if required. Do not think a dog daycare is a kennel.

Mr. Hajaar summarized what he is willing to do, move the outdoor area to the right side furthest away from the neighbors and put bushes in the back.

Mr. Dahlen and Mr. Hajaar went over the plans.

Mr. Goldberg and Burt Anderson went over plans.

Mr. Vantangoli expressed concern over facility becoming a kennel and boarding. Questioned whether this is open seven days per week and what are the hours.

Caitlin Anderson said the hours are Monday-Friday 6 AM – 6:30 PM and weekends 8 AM – 4 PM.

Mr. Dahlen stated that this needs to be continued.

Motion made by Mr. Goldberg to continue Off the Hook Dog Daycare to May 18, 2022, at 7:00 pm, and seconded by Mr. Mullen with a vote of 5-0-0.

VOTE: 5-0-0

Minutes: Motion made by Mr. dondero and seconded by Mr. Wrightington to approve 4/6/2022 minutes.

VOTE: I move to approve the 4/6/2022, Meeting minutes with a vote of 4-1-0. Mr. Goldberg abstained from voting as he was not at the hearing.

Motion to adjourn made by Mr. Dondero and seconded by Mr. Wrightington with a vote of 5-0-0.

VOTE: to Adjourn. 5-0-0

Adjourned: 9:26 PM