

**Summary of Discussion Questions -Committee Responses**

Question 1	Positive/negative responses	Comments/suggestions/opinions
<p><b>Should Pepperell modify the current zoning districts to allow for more moderate density development in some areas, as proposed in the last Comprehensive Plan?</b></p>	<p>Yes – 11 responses            No - 0 responses            Unsure/maybe – 3 responses</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. May create an opportunity for trails and/or parks</li> <li>2. Single family subdivisions are no longer efficient—the town is losing open space and rural character</li> <li>3. The town should make moderate-density housing more financially attractive to builders through incentives, starting with Main Street and the adjacent neighborhoods; create a “smart growth” economic development and housing plan for Main Street</li> <li>4. The town should provide amenities to make building moderate density housing more attractive: parking, bike paths, rotaries to slow traffic, building facades, reduced brightness of LED street lights, shade trees, etc.</li> <li>5. Re-write the zoning bylaw                -incorporate concentrated and mixed use development with sustainable development and smart growth principles</li> <li>6. Implement a low impact development bylaw</li> <li>7. Concentrate housing development within walking distance of amenities</li> <li>8. Could modify the requirement for 2-acre lots as a way of achieving more compact development; OSRD bylaw needs to be updated</li> <li>9. Should promote compact development to reduce GHG emissions</li> <li>10. More development should be allowed along state numbered routes, keeping in mind impacts to adjacent neighborhoods</li> <li>11. Broader application of the OSRD bylaw would allow a balance of denser development and additional open space</li> <li>12. Need additional senior housing, apartments, and small homes clustered on smaller lots</li> <li>13. Denser development will help attract and retain families</li> <li>14. Could examine expanding the urban residence two-family by right into certain areas of the suburban residence district, especially for over 55 and senior residents.</li> </ol>

<b>Question 1 (cont'd)</b>		15. Multi-family development could be allowed by right in the urban and suburban area, while meeting certain criteria and parking requirements, etc.
<b>Question 2</b>	<b>Positive/negative responses</b>	<b>Comments/suggestions/opinions</b>
<p><b>Q2a: Should Pepperell revise the OSRD bylaw to allow for smaller lot sizes for the residential portion of an OSRD project (perhaps ½-acre lots) and consolidate the open space to one section of the site, in order to maximize habitat and open space so that they would likely have a higher ecological value?</b></p>	<p>Yes – 12 responses  No – 0 responses  Unsure/Maybe – 2 responses</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Would like more information as to how the OSRD supports sustainability and resiliency</li> <li>2. Builders should be required to set aside funds to maintain site development features if they fail to design for future weather conditions</li> <li>3. Need to account for and plan for future climate scenarios by “redirecting development”</li> <li>4. Providing contiguous open space facilitates wildlife corridors</li> <li>5. The open space analysis and Conservation Commission recommendations should determine the best approach; either method should be allowed so that the approach can be site-specific</li> <li>6. Two respondents questioned NMCOG’s interpretation of the bylaw language in Section 7160, page 33 of the zoning bylaw</li> <li>7. Developers should be required to plant native trees/shrubs; develop a landscaping guide for builders and landscapers as other communities have done; consider reducing lawn areas or plant “no mow” native grasses.</li> <li>8. Should build denser residential developments with the balance of the projects devoted to open space and recreation</li> <li>9. The OSRD bylaw should be reviewed once the Master Plan is complete in conjunction with the overall zoning bylaw</li> </ol>

<p><b>Q2b: Should OSRD be mandatory outside of the sewer district, as recommended in the previous Master Plan?</b></p>	<p>Yes – 7 responses  No- 3 responses  Unsure/Maybe -3 responses  No comment – 1 response</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Focus should be on saving open lands and redirecting development to Main Street</li> <li>2. Open space should be encouraged, but mandatory regulations should be reserved for large scale project</li> <li>3. Mandatory regulations result in a lack of flexibility for the town</li> <li>4. One respondent questioned where NMCOG found this recommendation in the previous Master Plan. It can be found on page 1 in the last paragraph and reads: “Second, open space and farmlands must be retained by encouraging mandatory open space cluster developments outside of the Sewer Overlay District...”</li> <li>5. All zoning in Pepperell should account for the OSRD perspective in some way.</li> <li>6. Septic systems must be able to accommodate the smaller lot size</li> </ol>
<p><b>Q2c: Are there other improvements that need to be made to the OSRD bylaw?</b></p>	<p>Yes – 6 responses  No – 0 responses  Unsure/Maybe – 5 responses  No comment – 2 responses</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Requirement of homeowner’s association to cover common/shared space such as roadways, driveways, septic, wells, parking, dog parks, recreation, etc.</li> <li>2. Require developers to plant native trees/shrubs; create a landscaping guide for builders and developers</li> <li>3. Reduce size of lawn areas and/or require “no mow” native grasses in some spaces</li> <li>4. Encourage consolidated open space in development projects for recreational purposes</li> <li>5. OSRD should be taken up again, but given recent attempts at modifying the bylaw, not all OSRD development should be allowed by right, as the Planning Board needs to be able to approve each plan based on the merits of what is being proposed</li> <li>6. Requires more study; a study group should be formed the Massachusetts Smart Growth Tool Kit; examples from other communities should be researched</li> <li>7. Urban areas should be treated differently than other sections of town, with smaller areas of open space to benefit residents rather than focusing on the ecological benefit of the open space</li> </ol>

Question 3	Positive/negative responses	Comments/suggestions/opinions
<p><b>Should the Town lead by example and establish municipal policies that encourage healthy community design, such as installing benches, water fountains, street trees, public restrooms and bicycle racks at municipal properties and within the downtown business district?</b></p>	<p>Yes – 14 responses  No – 0 responses  Unsure/maybe – 0 responses</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Downtown business district must be addressed first to encourage foot traffic/business patronage</li> <li>2. Grant money should be sought to hire a consultant to develop a streetscaping and pedestrian/bike plan for Main Street; town policies should be developed to encourage implementation by identifying growth opportunities and incentives for businesses</li> <li>3. Re-write the town bylaws</li> <li>4. Who will pay for these things?</li> <li>5. Add bike lanes, extend sidewalks on rural roads, install water bottle filling stations—allocate money in the annual budget to implement design</li> <li>6. Participate in Complete Streets and Mass in Motion; implement traffic calming; establish gathering places to promote social interaction and community-building</li> <li>7. Consider form-based code for Railroad Square, with the goal to create a walkable village</li> <li>8. Install pedestrian accommodations in the business district (improved sidewalks, benches, more parking, crosswalks, street trees, wayfinding signs, bike racks)</li> <li>9. Create public restrooms for the bike path users</li> <li>10. Use non-porous paving materials</li> <li>11. Consider a bike-share program</li> <li>12. Accessibility needs of the elderly, strollers, disabled and young families should be considered in future designs</li> <li>13. Promote/encourage additional amenities for rail trail users such as restaurants, shops and bars; residents should be encouraged to visit other areas via bike and on-foot</li> <li>14. This should be undertaken in conjunction with the Main Street corridor study, in a way that is not a barrier to business development</li> </ol>

Question 4	Positive/negative responses	Comments/suggestions/opinions
<p><b>Should the Town strengthen the design standards within the zoning bylaw to provide more detailed guidance on the design of signs, lighting and landscaping?</b></p>	<p>Yes-10 responses  No- 1 response  Unsure/maybe- 1 response  2 members split their responses: yes for lighting and plant materials; no for signs</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Get rid of neon signs; regulate store window signs to make them more attractive</li> <li>2. Need to strengthen zoning and building codes, conduct research into the bylaws of other communities, and incorporate sustainable design principles to address climate change and resiliency. Incorporate green building design standards, energy conservation, and provide incentives to developers and homeowners to adopt LEED design.</li> <li>3. A dark sky friendly lighting bylaw is needed.</li> <li>4. LED lighting is problematic</li> <li>5. Energy efficient lighting is the most responsible policy, more lights rather than brighter lights are better for safety</li> <li>6. Participate in state programs such as Solarize Mass and implement municipal aggregation using renewable sources</li> <li>7. Sign size and location should be more regulated. Lettering size and color contrast is important for an aging population. Visual design standards could provide a consistent character and improve the visual appearance of the business areas.</li> <li>8. Sign design should be standardized in the historical district</li> <li>9. Native plants should be recommended, however non-native plants can create unique landscapes and compliment an area better.</li> <li>10. Development that reduces the need for water sources should be encouraged</li> <li>11. What about guidance for solar access?</li> <li>12. Energy efficiency and owner produced energy incentives should be included</li> <li>13. The design standards adopted in 2012 should be updated</li> <li>14. The zoning bylaw was last updated in 2014 but the updates were driven by the AG's office and not by local incentives; bylaws should be overhauled with guidance from the Smart Growth Alliance, along with research into alternative building materials</li> </ol>

		15. Streetscape improvements along the business corridors could offer opportunities for improved aesthetics, ecology, and pedestrian and parking amenities
<b>Question 5</b>	<b>Positive/negative responses</b>	<b>Comments/suggestions/opinions</b>
<b>Q5a: Should the Town re-examine the uses for commercial and industrial areas and set minimum lot size standards?</b>	Yes – 12 responses No – 0 responses Maybe/Unsure – 2 responses	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Must determine the kinds of business we want to attract to Main Street and then create zoning, amenities and infrastructure to support them</li> <li>2. There should be no self-storage facilities or contractor yards on Main Street or in Railroad Square, but they are appropriate along 119 and in Lomar Park.</li> <li>3. Need to know where there are existing conflicts between commercial zones and residential areas, and determine what small-scale development is appropriate.</li> <li>4. How does the town provide structural support for the self-employed? How should the zoning bylaw support the self-employed?</li> <li>5. Should allow home-based business uses where there will be no neighborhood traffic impacts; talk to residents with young families</li> <li>6. The zoning bylaw should be updated to allow the concentration of commercial, mixed-use, multi-family in certain areas</li> <li>7. Minimum lot size should be established to control development patterns</li> <li>8. Multi-use zoning should be reconsidered. Lack of commercial zoning along Route 119 may mean that the town is missing opportunities; examine other properties between Lakin Street and Proctor Road.</li> <li>9. Pepperell is sorely lacking commercial zoning districts as residents must leave town to meet most of their needs—need to keep opportunities and money in Pepperell.</li> <li>10. Need to leverage the rail trail to build business opportunities-why are there vacant stores and 3 nail salons in Railroad Square? Need to encourage restaurant and retail investments.</li> <li>11. Mixed use areas that incorporate commercial development and high-density low-income housing opportunities are needed</li> </ol>

		<p>12. Need to seek out amenity businesses such as retail, restaurants, fitness facilities, hotels and recreational businesses. Need to encourage farm-to-table restaurants and discourage chain restaurants</p> <p>13. Need to expand commercial uses to include agricultural enterprises such as farm stands.</p> <p>14. Light manufacturing, warehouses, self-storage and wind energy should be allowed in the industrial district, not in the commercial district</p> <p>15. Would like to explore industrial opportunities in Pepperell</p> <p>16. Some uses are incompatible in the town center and Railroad Square. These uses should be eliminated and minimum lot sizes should be established.</p> <p>17. Current commercial lot sizes may already be too small for the needs of larger businesses, such as the new Dunkin’s on Main Street. Need to look at regulations in other communities.</p>
<p><b>5b: Should there be more than one commercial zone, to more closely reflect the character of these areas?</b></p>	<p>Yes – 8 responses No- 2 responses Unsure/maybe – 4 responses</p>	<p>1. Railroad Square should be evaluated for additional commercial opportunities along Railroad Street and Hotel Place; Route 119 should also be examined.</p> <p>2. Zoning changes and other strategies should be evaluated to fill vacant properties along Main Street</p> <p>3. Businesses already exist along Routes 113 and 119; zoning should reflect their current use.</p> <p>4. Needed to stimulate additional economic development, employment, revenues and consumer choices</p>
<p><b>5c: Are there other locations in Pepperell that should be zoned for limited, small-scale commercial use, such as neighborhood style businesses?</b></p>	<p>Yes- 8 responses No- 0 responses Unsure/maybe – 6 responses</p>	<p>1. The question needs to go through the Planning Board and Board of Selectmen</p> <p>2. Especially along the Main Street and Park Street areas of town.</p> <p>3. Need clear definition of what “limited, small-scale commercial use” and “neighborhood style” mean</p> <p>4. Neighborhood, in-home small-scale commercial use should be accommodated where it is compatible with the neighborhood.</p> <p>5. Peter Fitzpatrick School should continue to be evaluated</p>

		<p>6. Along Main Street where water and conservation land will not be impacted</p> <p>7. Doc Davis is a great example of neighborhood style business</p> <p>8. Perhaps special permits could be applied</p> <p>9. These locations should be identified as part of a review of the zoning bylaws</p> <p>10. Canal Street, Groton Street and Leighton Street are possible locations</p>
<b>Question 6</b>	<b>Positive/negative responses</b>	<b>Comments/suggestions/opinions</b>
<p><b>Q6a: The previous Master Plan recommended that the potential for a new mixed-use village in the Brookline Street/Hollis Street area be examined, as well as allowing mixed-use in the Historic District, in order to preserve older, larger homes by allowing for adaptive reuse. Should these recommendations be carried forward into the new Master Plan?</b></p>	<p>Yes-11 responses</p> <p>No- 0 responses</p> <p>Unsure/Maybe- 3 responses</p>	<p>1. Carefully-the exceptions outlined in the MUOD district should be revisited</p> <p>2. Criteria shaped by sustainability and resiliency should be used to guide future housing creation and infrastructure needs</p> <p>3. This issue should be re-examined; I favor allowing mixed residential uses in the Historic District north of the rotary and in the Brookline/Hollis Street area, with mixed commercial residential uses allowed along the Main Street/Tarbell/Railroad Square corridor</p> <p>4. Exploration of other uses/zoning for municipal buildings such as Peter Fitz should be considered</p> <p>5. Completely overhaul the zoning bylaws to provide a blueprint for a more sustainable future that addresses climate resilience</p> <p>6. Historic preservation is paramount in the historic district. Mixed uses could have a negative impact with changes that lead to architectural incompatibility. A local (rather than National Register) historic district would help with regulating these projects, or strict regulation would be needed through the special permit process.</p> <p>7. Brookline and Hollis Streets are near the Nissitissit River and potential impacts on the river need to be considered.</p> <p>8. As with other zoning changes, renewable energy incentives should be included</p> <p>9. Town previously decided not to pursue this but it should be revisited with modifications to the previous proposal highlighting the benefits to Main Street aesthetically.</p>

<p><b>Q6b: Are there other locations in town where mixed use should be explored?</b></p>	<p>Yes- 8 responses No- 0 responses Unsure/maybe – 6 responses</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Once needs and criteria are established, look at areas around Main Street, Brookline Street and Hollis Street for mixed-use and adaptive reuse potential. The Peter Fitzpatrick School (19 acres) may also be suitable.</li> <li>2. Park Street, Elm Street and Townsend Street</li> <li>3. Options along Route 119 should be explored given its visibility and marketing potential, along with 111, 113, Railroad Square/Tarbell Street area</li> </ol>
<p><b>Question 7</b></p>	<p><b>Positive/negative responses</b></p>	<p><b>Comments/suggestions/opinions</b></p>
<p><b>The zoning in the area around Railroad Square and the adjoining neighborhood does not reflect the land use pattern that is there today. In fact, most of the homes in the neighborhood could not be built under the current zoning bylaw. Should the zoning in this area be revised to allow for similar village-style development?</b></p>	<p>Yes- 10 responses No- 0 responses Unsure/ Maybe – 3 responses No Comment – 1 response</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The town should identify potential “village” neighborhoods and examine the zoning bylaw so that village development is aided. Concurrently, examine commercial and business zoning so that village and business areas do not overlap.</li> <li>2. Need definition of “village style” development. Not clear where there is land to build and it is already congested.</li> <li>3. Should incorporate mixed use, Complete Streets, Mass in Motion programs, and traffic calming</li> <li>4. This area provided smaller dwellings that benefit the aging population and empty nesters. In addition, the homes are located close to the services and amenities. This also creates a market for the businesses.</li> <li>5. This should be done in conjunction with a review of the zoning bylaws.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Question 8</b></p>	<p><b>Positive/negative responses</b></p>	<p><b>Comments/suggestions/opinions</b></p>
<p><b>Should Pepperell adopt inclusionary zoning requiring that affordable housing for low- and moderate-income residents be incorporated in residential development projects over a certain size, for example 7 units?</b></p>	<p>Yes- 10 responses No- 0 responses Unsure/ Maybe – 4 responses</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 40B has not created the units desired and Pepperell has not met the State’s target. We need to determine how many units are needed to meet the State’s target, establish housing goals, and determine how housing can be included in the town’s plans, such as Main Street, neighborhood villages and mixed use areas. Access to public transit and amenities should be considered in determining potential locations</li> <li>2. Inclusionary but not mandatory</li> <li>3. How will this affect the cost of the units?</li> <li>4. Not sure if 7 is the correct number</li> </ol>

		<p>5. Pepperell should work aggressively to meet its 10% goal so that we have control over 40B projects; given the number of market-based units being produced we will never meet the 10% goal without this requirement</p> <p>6. Increase the affordability requirement to 25% for large project; explore state and federal incentive programs for constructing large multi-family projects that are 100% affordable for seniors, and separate multi-family housing for disabled residents. However, high-rise buildings higher than 2 or 3 stories should not be allowed.</p> <p>7. Larger scale housing developments should include low and moderate-income residents in suburban locations. For developments that are in a rural zone, affordability requirements for less valuable homes would detract from the development project or sale of real estate.</p> <p>8. Include energy efficiency and renewable energy incentives</p> <p>9. We need to maintain design standards and requirement to maintain small town feel</p> <p>10. Should review Littleton’s IZ bylaw</p> <p>11. This requirement would facilitate additional state funding</p>
<b>Question 9</b>	<b>Positive/negative responses</b>	<b>Comments/suggestions/opinions</b>
<b>Should Pepperell strengthen and modernize its flood/floodplain regulations and incorporate the regulations with the Town’s zoning bylaw?</b>	<p>Yes- 14 responses</p> <p>No-0 responses</p> <p>Unsure/Maybe – 0 responses</p>	<p>1. Is the Town required to do this by MEMA/FEMA?</p> <p>2. This is critically important in light of climate change. Enforcement also needs to be improved. Responsibility rests with the building inspector and Planning Board.</p> <p>3. There should also be a structural assessment of the town’s dams, roads and bridges, and money should be set aside for improvements to address future flood risks.</p> <p>4. Zoning regulations, Conservation Commission regulations, and policies should be re-examined, water bodies and resources should be protected; involve non-profit organizations, such as NRWA and land trusts</p> <p>5. Should formulate a plan for climate resiliency and emergency management</p>

		<p>6. If FEMA’s regulations are not protective enough relative to climate change, perhaps Pepperell should modify its own regulations.</p> <p>7. We should work regionally on this issue and reach out to surrounding towns.</p>
<b>Question 10</b>	<b>Positive/negative responses</b>	<b>Comments/suggestions/opinions</b>
<p><b>Should the Town modify its development regulations to ensure that proposed projects provide safe access and internal circulation for older adults, and that housing is designed to allow residents to age in place?</b></p>	<p>Yes- 9 responses  No-3 responses  Unsure/Maybe – 2 responses</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Should be specific to elderly housing</li> <li>2. These features would add very little to the cost of a project. The Town could offer aging in place information to homeowners, developers and contractors.</li> <li>3. In addition to these items, the town should address crosswalks, sidewalks, curbing, etc., to make the town safe for the elderly and disabled.</li> <li>4. All of the recommendations contained in the Achieving Healthy Living for Older Adults chapter should be adopted by the Master Plan Committee.</li> <li>5. Should apply to senior housing and should be combined with housing for younger people, and the needs of the disabled should be considered</li> <li>6. Should consider the impacts of excessive heat and poor air quality due to climate change; green building and climate controls are needed; businesses should have better access and public spaces should be dementia friendly. All municipal buildings should go green.</li> <li>7. Should apply to public and commercial buildings, and to large scale housing developments, but small-scale housing development should not be regulated.</li> <li>8. Can inclusionary zoning be modified to apply to a small portion of a new building?</li> </ol>

Question 11	Positive/negative responses	Comments/suggestions/opinions
<p><b>Should the Town modify its zoning bylaw to accommodate and encourage solar energy systems?</b></p>	<p>Yes- 13 responses  No-0 responses  Unsure/Maybe – 1 response</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Should also encourage solar storage</li> <li>2. The town should require National Grid to estimate the electrical load from solar that can be accommodated through the existing distribution/transmission system. Grid resiliency also needs to be considered. The town should monitor the latest clean energy research and products coming to market, including clean transportation-perhaps there should be a technology committee.</li> <li>3. The town’s website should be expanded to include a page on solar with the latest information on pricing, subsidies, contractors and other information needed to expand solar.</li> <li>4. The town should encourage solar farms and do not forget wind.</li> <li>5. There should be height restrictions for roof-top installations; free-standing solar should only be allowed on sites of 10 acres or more.</li> <li>6. Need a plan to manage solar installations based on best practices.</li> <li>7. Should review the SolSmart recommendations and adopt as many as possible</li> <li>8. The Planning Board needs to conduct research and have conversations with the community</li> <li>9. The town should offer real estate tax incentives, consider climate change and resiliency, and require all commercial and municipal buildings to be green.</li> <li>10. The town should establish an energy committee using DOER guidance.</li> <li>11. The SolSmart designation process should be completed, including the needed zoning changes.</li> <li>12. We need a solar installation on our landfill.</li> </ol>

Question 12	Positive/negative responses	Comments/suggestions/opinions
<p><b>Should the Town modify its land use regulations to support and promote agricultural enterprises? This could include allowing farm retail sales in residential districts, and/or allowing farm co-ops and food processing facilities by right.</b></p>	<p>Yes-10 responses  No-0 responses  Unsure/Maybe-0 responses  No comment-2 responses</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Climate change will impact food security; we need to plan ahead and save our farmland-encourage young people to become farmers, provide financing for farm enterprises, save farmland from development, promote Pepperell as a farming community, and encourage backyard plots. This can be done through land use regulations.</li> <li>2. There needs to be some oversight for safe food handling and humane treatment of livestock</li> <li>3. Food processing seems more commercial than agricultural; there should be a minimum lot size requirement for certain uses.</li> <li>4. A special permit should be required to mitigate neighborhood impacts, permits for pop-up farm-to-table dinners at farm properties should be considered.</li> <li>5. Traditional farming should not be allowed in close proximity to denser areas such as urban residence and suburban residence, due to odors, chemicals, etc. Minimum lot size, minimum setbacks, and building coverage restrictions are needed to discourage housing animals on small lots.</li> <li>6. Farm stands should be allowed on-site but restricted to selling what they produce.</li> <li>7. Do we really want a large food processing plant or a cooperate pig farm?</li> <li>8. These things are allowed by special permits—eg, Wilkins, Kimballs, Dragonfly Farm, etc. The Farmer’s Market could be more robust.</li> <li>9. Need to consider climate change impacts on agriculture</li> </ol>

Question 13	Positive/negative responses	Comments/suggestions/opinions
<p><b>Should the zoning bylaw be amended to encourage art and artisan related establishments, such as artist work/live space, studio space, galleries and museums?</b></p>	<p>Yes – 11 responses  No- 0 responses  Unsure/Maybe -3 responses</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. These uses should be allowed by special permit in locations like the Peter Fitzpatrick School.</li> <li>2. Should encourage short-term leases for pop-up establishments in chronically empty buildings</li> <li>3. Allowing the use of livable dwelling space above industrial uses and in other zones would encourage these activities.</li> <li>4. Especially suitable in village/neighborhood style business settings to encourage local cultural activities and economic growth.</li> </ol>
Question 14	Positive/negative responses	Comments/suggestions/opinions
<p>Should contractor yards and commercial landscaping businesses continue to be allowed by special permit as accessory uses in residential neighborhoods?</p>	<p>Yes – 5 responses  No- 8 responses  Probably not- 1 response</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. These businesses require movement of heavy equipment and materials and should be separated from residential uses.</li> <li>2. Should be allowed by special permit with the proviso that there be no visible advertising or exposed equipment in residential areas</li> <li>3. Should only be allowed in industrial areas</li> <li>4. Probably not or there needs to be control over design and growth and there should be regular planning board inspections.</li> <li>5. Concerned about the storage of chemicals at these businesses, particularly near environmentally sensitive areas, schools and highly populated neighborhoods</li> <li>6. If the special permit is protective of the neighbors in terms of noise, lighting, visual impact and odor, they are not detrimental to the neighborhood</li> </ol>