

I am Saul Beaumont, 3 Fieldstone Lane and I am a town meeting member for precinct 10.

I am here because I am an advocate of Warrant article 27 because I care about Natick, I believe in the sacred meaning of the zoning bylaws which are written to protect our homes, and because many residents have reached out to me because I am a Town Meeting Member and because they have seen my activity supporting residents whose neighborhoods have been threatened to be disrupted by kennels. I represent many people tonight and I do this as a friend not as a professional. Everyone who I've talked to in a neighborhood affected by the last three kennel permit applications is in opposition to kennels in a residential area and are in full support of Article 27 and we hope that the board will have a favorable reaction to article 27

I'd like to share my thoughts of what's been happening with the current bylaw so that you will understand the importance of supporting this article

Also many of the residents who could not be here tonight requested that I read the messages that they have given to me to read to you which I will summarize at the end.

I've looked at what I have prepared and what has been contributed for this evening and I realize even more how serious a threat that this is to disrupt residential neighborhoods where people raise a family, live out their dreams, and perhaps retire. The environment around the place we call home is not a trivial matter.

The purpose of article 27 is to remove the option for kennels to be in a residential zone via a special permit that was established around fifty years ago long before doggy parks and doggy exercise areas existed. Most residents in residential areas do not want commercial kennels in their neighborhood and a residential area is just not the place for a business.

Kennels and dog exercise companies perform a needed service for many residents and are great companies but they belong in commercial areas not in residential areas.

Currently in the Natick zoning bylaws, item 53 for dog kennels, a kennel is permitted only with a special permit in three of the eleven Natick zones: RG (residential general), RS(residential single) and CII (commercial II). Kennels are prohibited in all other zones including RM(residential multiple). It is important to note that this bylaw has existed since the 1960's and one of the issues over the years and in particular, a few weeks ago, has been the interpretation of the word kennel. It is obvious that it was meant for an individual at home to have several dogs and perhaps breed some for sale or hunting but not to run a commercial business because by omitting kennels in zone RM, they demonstrate that they are trying to avoid disruption of a residential neighborhood but back in the 60s, RS and RG had room for small kennels and they felt the impact on those neighborhoods could be controlled by the process of obtaining a special permit from the zoning appeals board.

In the past year there have been three applications for special permits for kennels in residential areas which were 185 Eliot street, 56 Eliot hill rd, and 42 Leach lane all of which caused great grief amongst the abutters and neighbors. In the cases of eliot st and eliot hill rd, overwhelming local opposition to the application resulted in the withdrawal of the applications by the applicants. Unfortunately, with Leach lane which is not a kennel but is actually an illegally existing exercise park located in an aquifer charging area where 450 dogs are brought in every week (90 per day) with a resultant 700 gallons of urine and 5000lbs of feces which are removed but the bacteria is spread on the ground and spreads naturally in the neighborhood and into the Brook that feeds the Charles river. This doggy exercise area does not fit the original meaning of kennel, and despite 100% opposition of the abutters and neighbors on Brook st and Brook lane, the planning board made a 4 to 1 decision to authorize a permit. Currently this permit is on hold while the residents go through the process and expense of appeal to the Massachusetts land court (\$255 to file and legal estimates from \$1000-\$25,000). In the planning board discussions about Leach lane, there were comments like "my hands are tied and I must vote for it because it is a kennel" so the vote was determined by one word found in the bylaw but not by the intent of the Natick bylaws. It is not the purpose of the bylaw to twist wording to impose an unwanted business on a neighborhood. The bylaws not only include the use regulations schedule but also an instruction to protect the town residents. The instruction of the bylaws is and I quote "In order to preserve and to promote the life, health, safety, morals, convenience and welfare of the townspeople, to lessen the danger from fire, to improve and beautify the town, to protect real estate from damaging uses of adjacent property and to further the social and economic prosperity of the community". The elected representatives of the Planning Board were obliged to not only read the word kennel but also to consider the intent of its meaning and also to consider the well being of the town residents and especially the abutters. 100% opposition to a permit requires that the board look at the entire bylaw not just one word. By eliminating the option for a kennel in a residential area in the bylaw via Article 27, the aggravation, cost, and disruption of the residential neighborhoods are eliminated.

It should be noted that neighboring Framingham, Needham, Sherborn, Waltham, Wellesley, and Weston do not allow commercial kennels in residential areas. The common theme is that they recognize the need to protect the residential areas. There are commercial areas where the business can be run but the disruption to residential neighborhoods is unacceptable.

Many people have asked that I speak for them at this meeting. I would like to read some excerpts from the statements they have given to me. **Add comments here (P. 3, 4, 5)**

In closing, the purpose of Article 27 is to eliminate the option for special permits for kennels in residential areas. The overwhelming opposition every time a kennel is proposed demonstrates the overwhelming resident opinion that kennel businesses do not belong in a residential area. It is respectfully requested that you vote for favorable action on Article 27 on Tuesday, Sep 18. It is important that WA27 happens now to help correct a current problem with Doggy Dates. Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to address you this evening.

2 Carolyn Evans

~~SAUL PLEASE DO ALL THAT YOU CAN!!~~

For every reason you've listed, a single family residential is NO PLACE FOR A KENNEL OR OTHER COMMERCIAL BUSINESSES.

The property values of our neighborhood is of utmost importance.

4 Daniela Mihal

By prohibiting kennel business in a single family residential zone we will have a quiet residential area, not crowded with traffic, less environmental pollution, and we will not lose on our property values.

Community
The community benefits:

- surrounding soil and waterways will not be contaminated with animal waste matter, food or cleaning products, chemicals, disinfectants
- less vehicle movements (especially in route 16)
- less noise in the area (no barking episodes)
- no flies/vermin ~~by the use of disinfectants~~
- avoid odor and spread of respiratory infections

✓ Ery magasanik - A kennel is a "business". That creates a precedent for who knows what might come next . It opens the door even if only a crack

I [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Everyone understands how to use a hammer and going to work
 Farmer that is not a farmer and a farmer that is not a farmer, etc

Michael Marotta

~~Here are my thoughts on this Warrant Article:~~

~~I support this effort to restrict businesses in single family residential zones.~~ As a dog owner, I rely on the services provided by kennels, but I also believe it would be unfair to allow a kennel or other type of business that has noise, traffic and other impacts into an established residential neighborhood. Most homeowners work hard to maintain the value of their property, but allowing a business such as this to open nearby would adversely impact the quality of life and home values for residents.

Joan Scott

A Kennel
~~Residential objections are expressed to the proposed applicant for the proposed kennel in the neighborhood. I am concerned about the potential for a kennel that will disturb the wildlife, cause noise irritation to the neighbors and spoil the peace-in-nature residential aspect of why we all live in the area - to hear birds singing not dogs barking.~~

2 Jennifer & Matthew Carroll 14 Elliot Hill Road ~~we are strongly opposed to the kennel, as~~
~~we are many of our neighbors, as it will negatively affect the quality of life of current residents due to~~
~~noise, smells, and increased traffic.~~

in our neighborhood
A dog kennel would have a drastic negative impact on the value of the homes, ~~in this quiet neighborhood.~~

3 Todd & Alison Fleisher, 8 Aqueduct Road. South Natick

in our neighborhood
~~We do not want to see a commercial enterprise in a residential zone. We have many concerns about the potential increase in traffic and the disruption and danger it poses to the many young children (including our own) and families on foot and bikes. This would increase noise to our beautiful and quiet neighborhood.~~

1 Kerry Conley, South Natick, 11 Aqueduct rd ~~Natick Planning Board P. Application for site review and special permit to operate an indoor/outdoor dog kennel at 11 Everett St. As I will be unable to attend the meeting on July 23, 2018, I am submitting this application. I am opposed to this application for the following reasons:~~

~~1. We are living by home and property and we are not a residential area. It is our understanding that this is not a residential area and it is not intended to reduce property values in the area or adjoining districts by reason of dirt, dust, gas, sewage, refuse, noise, vibration, or danger of explosion or fire.~~

we purchased over
a. As a resident of the neighborhood, I believe this would reduce property values. We all purchased our homes with the expectation that the zoning would not change, and the neighbors and neighborhood would remain a single-family home area. If I were to sell my house with a newly ~~zoned~~ dog kennel in the neighborhood, it might be a deterrent to prospective buyers. I would not purchase a house in such a neighborhood. Therefore, my property value could potentially decrease.

Richard Langeren

0011834

(4) Noise

The current neighbor has a dog. Being close to the Audubon and with considerable natural forest in the area, the neighborhood has wildlife passing through these properties including deer, fox, coyotes, skunks, racoons, and rabbits. When the dog sees or hears these animals its barking is loud and reverberates throughout the entire neighborhood and across the river. A kennel of dogs barking in this manner amid a tranquil residential neighborhood would be a significant infringement on the peace and tranquility of the neighborhood.

(5) Declining Tax Revenues

Allowing a commercial business to operate amid this residential community will significantly and negatively impact the resale and property values of the adjacent properties which will reduce the tax revenues to the Town of Natick far more than the taxes collected from this commercial business.

(7) Animal Safety

Animal safety is a serious risk. The potential for wild animals infected with diseases such as rabies, in animals such as coyotes, foxes or other animals, is a serious risk to the neighborhood. Not only from the risk of the dogs being bitten by a rabid animal, but the mere fact that diseased animals may be attracted into the neighborhood by the caged dogs.

(10) Environmental Impact

Has the Town assessed the environmental impact of liquid and solid animal waste leaching into the environmentally sensitive ground water and even into the adjacent Charles River?

(11) Waste Products & Odors

The waste bi-products and odors from these animals will certainly negatively affect the natural fresh air of the neighborhood.

13. Commercial Property is Available

Natick has an abundance of commercial property available for such a such a business. The Town should not support approving a commercial business in a residential neighborhood.

5 of 5
5/13