



OFFICE OF THE
TOWN CLERK

SOUTHBOROUGH, MASSACHUSETTS 01772
485-0710 Ext. 4-7

HOURS
MON. TO FRI. 9:00 - 5:00
TUE. EVE. 7:30 - 8:30

I, Paul J. Berry, Town Clerk of the Town of Southborough, Massachusetts,
hereby certify as follows:

1. The SOUTHBOROUGH BOARD OF APPEALS DECISION dated: July 25, 1990
at 7:30 P. M. relative to a petition of
Leaf Systems, Inc.
2. TWENTY days have elapsed since said filing; and
3. No appeal therefrom has been filed.
4. The original thereof was filed with me as said Clerk on August 8, 1990 ;
at 9:35 A.M.

WITNESS MY HAND and the TOWN SEAL of SOUTHBOROUGH this 28th day of
August, 1990, at 10:15 A. M.

A true copy:
Attest:

Paul J. Berry
PAUL J. BERRY, TOWN CLERK

(TOWN SEAL)

RECEIPT OF THE ABOVE IS HEREBY ACKNOWLEDGED ON

August 31, 1990
date

Maurice Accary
SIGNATURE

Paul J. Berry
PAUL J. BERRY, TOWN CLERK

August 8, 1990

Paul J. Berry
Town Clerk
Town Hall
Southborough, MA 01772

DECISION ON A PETITION
FOR A VARIANCE

LEAF SYSTEMS, INC.
250 TURNPIKE ROAD (27-2A)

The Board of Appeals of the Town of Southborough held a public hearing in the hearing room on the second floor of the Southborough Town House, 17 Common Street on Wednesday, July 25, 1990 at 7:30 p.m. with regard to the petition of Leaf Systems, Inc. for a special permit as per the Town of Southborough Zoning Code, Article III, Section 174-8, Paragraph B, (3),(b), Use Regulations. The Petitioner is seeking a special permit for light manufacturing and assembly in an Industrial District.

Sitting as a Board were the members: Peter Roche, Acting Chair
Joseph F. Prior, Jr.
Thomas Starr
Joseph Gill
Salvatore M. Giorlandino

Mr. Jeffrey Grossman spoke in behalf of the petitioners.

EVIDENCE PRESENTED

1. Leaf Systems, Inc. (hereinafter referred to as Leaf) is a light assembly business currently located in the Apple Hill Office Building on Rte. 9 in Natick, commonly referred to as Loehmann's Plaza.
2. Leaf designs and manufactures computer terminals and telecommunications equipment for the transmission and editing of photographs by newspaper photographers and photo editors.
3. Products manufactured by Leaf are distributed exclusively by the Associated Press.
4. The manufacturing process used by Leaf is commonly described as light assembly. Components such as printed circuit boards, chassis, and integrated circuits are manufactured by other companies and purchased by Leaf. Leaf inserts and solders the

integrated circuits into the printed circuit boards and then wires the assembled boards into the chassis.

5. The products assembled by Leaf are small in size; the largest product is the size of a typical personal computer.

6. The manufacturing process used by Leaf is clean and harmless. No noxious offensive, harmful or hazardous fumes, noise, or odors are emitted.

7. Petitioner submitted that their application for special permit deals exclusively with the existing structure and the present footprint of the building.

8. Presently, there are 193 parking spaces located on the site.

9. Petitioner presently employs 40 people at their existing site in Natick.

10. Petitioner submitted that traffic study by SEA in 1986 found that overall impact of the building would have minimum impact on the Town of Southborough. Petitioner submitted that their proposed use of the existing building will not impact traffic by more than 10 percent and quoted an afternoon peak increase of 5.6 percent.

11. Petitioner submitted that the use sought is strictly light assembly and engineering and does not involve service, sales or marketing of their product.

12. Landscaping plans will provide increased shrub development. The plan has been approved and is in the process of being implemented.

13. Petitioner stated that there are no plans to develop the residential property located on the site.

14. There are two small loading docks presently located on the site.

15. The Petitioner submitted that immediate plans are to locate the light manufacturing space on the first floor and office and common space on remaining two floors.

16. The Chairman of the Planning Board submitted that the landscape plan is much improved and that he and the City Planner personally visited the site due to abutters' concerns. The Chairman stated that the original site plan prohibits egress onto Parkerville Road from the residential property.

17. Glen Fyrberg, 242 Turnpike Road, a direct abutter, expressed concerns about the use of hazardous materials, future plans to create a second work shift, plans to work on Saturdays and the required buffer between his property and the Petitioner's

existing parking lot.

18. Jeff Page, 9 Sarsen Stone Way, expressed concern about the future use of the residential area.

19. Jack Prendegast, 3 Skylar Drive, asked if conditions could be placed on the use of the property if the special permit is granted.

20. Fred Harvey, 129 Parkerville Road, expressed concern about light fixtures existing in the parking lot. He stated that the lights were originally supposed to be smaller in size and asked if the lights could be retrofitted to lower/smaller lights, or turned off when not in use.

21. Dan Bradley, 1 Sarsen Stone Way, expressed concern about truck traffic due to the size of the building.

22. Petitioner submitted that very little truck traffic is generated due to the price of an individual unit and their monthly product sales. The price per unit is \$25,000. An average of 50 units are sold each month to one customer, Associated Press, New Jersey.

23. Margaret Fyrberg, 242 Turnpike Road, expressed concern about 10' buffer between her property and Petitioner's existing parking lot.

24. Alan Modest, 3 Sarsen Stone Way, expressed concern about the clearing of trees on the property.

25. No one spoke in favor of the special permit.

26. Jack Prendegast spoke in opposition to the special permit without protective restrictions.

27. Dan Bradley spoke in opposition to the special permit without protective restrictions.

28. Petitioner (Mr. Caspie) stated that they would agree to the buffer zone to protect the trees.

29. Petitioner stated that they would correct the buffer problem expressed by the Fyrbergs.

30. Petitioner submitted that they would correct the lighting problems expressed by Mr. Fred Harvey of Parkerville Road.

FINDINGS

1. No Town boards or commissions spoke in opposition to the special permit request.

2. Abutters expressed concerns about future plans for expansion, clearing of the existing tree buffer, present lighting in the parking lot and egress onto Parkerville Road.

3. Petitioner answered most of the neighborhood complaints and concerns in a positive fashion, showing good faith to correct existing problems and the desire to be a good neighbor in the future.

THEREFORE, THE BOARD OF APPEALS, based on the evidence presented at the hearing, including but not limited to the facts presented above, voted to: GRANT WITH FOLLOWING RESTRICTIONS: 5-0

1. That no building shall be erected on the Residential A lot.

2. That no egress shall be allowed from the property onto Parkerville Road.

3. That 25' buffer of wooded area be maintained where residential properties meet.

4. That no more than 50% of the total square footage of the building shall be used for light manufacturing and assembly.

5. That no second or third light manufacturing and assembly shifts shall be allowed.

the SPECIAL PERMIT.. The Board specifically finds that the use sought is in harmony with the intent and purpose of the zoning by-law. It is not in conflict with the public health, safety, convenience or welfare and is not detrimental nor offensive to the neighborhood.



Peter Roche, Acting Chairman