



Minutes for Meeting

Zoning Board of Appeals, via Zoom

September 23, 2022 at 12:00 PM

Members present: Jane Fisher Carlson, Winifred I. Li, Natalie B. Sawyer

**70 Black Oak Road:** a continuation of a hearing on a request by Jonathan Klandrud on behalf of Prashanth Palakurthi requesting a variance for a multi-use structure.

The following members were present:

- Jane Fisher Carlson, Chair
- Winifred I. Li
- Natalie B. Sawyer, Acting Secretary

Additional documents in the record include:

- Memo from Prashanth Palakurthi dated 9/20/22
- Letter from Erik Grunigen dated 9/21/22

Jonathan Klandrud, general contractor, Erik Grunigen, architect, and Prashanth Palakurthi, the Petitioner appeared before the Board. The Petitioner had submitted a memo describing the intended uses of the recording studio as “strictly for non-commercial usage, and will be used for practice sessions at home.”

The Board noted that it had become aware, as a result of the reference to “Juju Productions” on the architectural drawings, that a commercial production entity was incorporated with a business address at the Premises, and that a Juju Productions website solicits business of other artists. According to its records of organization, Juju Productions is engaged in “[t]he

promotion, performance and production of all expressions of arts and culture.” The Petitioner stated that although the building will be commercial in the sense that it will be used for a business, there will be no customers, clients, or paying audiences at the Premises. The Petitioner also represented that Juju Productions is a music label company that only markets music of other musicians and does not create music for other musicians. The Petitioner reiterated his representation that the recording studio space and equipment will be used “strictly” for practice sessions with him and his wife, and that other musicians will join them to practice on very rare occasions.

The Board engaged in a discussion of the criteria for the issuance of a variance, including the existence of a hardship. Upon inquiry, the Petitioner agreed that no hardship exists which would support the granting of a variance. Thereafter, the Petitioner requested permission to withdraw his request for a variance.

Following due and open deliberation, the Board, by unanimous decision, allowed the Petitioner to withdraw the request for a variance without prejudice.