



TOWN OF NORTHBOROUGH PLANNING BOARD

Town Hall Offices • 63 Main Street • Northborough, MA 01532 • 508-393-5019 • 508-393-6996 Fax

Approved 6.5.18

**Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
February 6, 2018**

Members in attendance: Theresa Capobianco, Chair; Michelle Gillespie; Leslie Harrison; George Pember; Amy Poretzky

Others in attendance: Kathy Joubert, Town Planner; Fred Litchfield, Town Engineer; Robert Federico, Building Inspector; Tom Reardon; Carolyn Harrington; John Garton; Carolyn Guarino

Chair Theresa Capobianco called the meeting to order at 7:05pm

Continued Discussion with Judi Barrett, Barrett Planning Group RE: Duplex Moratorium and Zoning Amendments for 2018 Town Meeting

Ms. Capobianco explained that Ms. Barrett was not able to attend this evening's meeting but did provide the board with some recommendations and draft bylaws. She noted that the two issues remaining to be addressed by the board are with regards to building height and minimum lot size. She indicated that Mr. Federico is here tonight to explain how building height is measured.

Mr. Federico noted that board members had been provided with an excerpt from the zoning bylaw about how height is determined. He explained that the starting point for measuring is an average elevation of where the finished grade meets the foundation of the building. He stated that an average between the highest and lowest elevation points is calculated, and then measured straight up in a vertical to the midpoint of the roof (not the eaves or the ridge). He commented that, in essence, the height is measured from the average of the ground elevation to an average of the roof height, with steeples, antennas, cupolas and chimneys not being part of the height restriction.

Mr. Federico stated that the formula is very typical of a lot of zoning and is echoed throughout the definitions in the state building code. In response to a question from Ms. Capobianco about a walkout basement, Mr. Federico indicated that this would not change the analysis of average grade. He explained that the current bylaw allows no more than three stories above grade. He also noted that there had been some discussion about limiting structures to no more than 2 ½ stories but cautioned the board that this could create issues since the state building code allows 3 stories. He explained that if someone were to want to build a house with a walkup attic with a legitimate set of stairs, this would result in a third story that would require a variance from this board.

Ms. Capobianco recalled that the board had discussed a 35 foot height restriction and had not imposed any delineation on number of stories. Mr. Federico noted that the minimum ceiling height in modern construction is 7 feet, so putting a limit on the number of stories simply creates problems.

Ms. Gillespie noted that Ms. Barrett had indicated that many communities measure the height up to the ridgeline of the roof and questioned why Mr. Federico would not recommend doing so. Mr. Federico

stated that it would be up to the board and the town's resident to decide that, but cautioned the board about having conflicting definitions between the state building code and town zoning bylaw that might not get approved by the Attorney General (AG). Ms. Gillespie commented that, if the AG has already approved this for other communities, she would assume it would be approved for Northborough as well.

Ms. Gillespie recalled that building height has been a concern from the beginning. Ms. Harrison asked if the town's zoning bylaw supersedes the state code. Ms. Joubert stated that it does not necessarily, which is why the former Building Inspector preferred not to include this in the zoning bylaw and defer to the state code. She confirmed that a height restriction of 35 feet as previously discussed is a very standard measurement for a residential dwelling. She also noted that there had been some previous comments that measuring to the ridge line could result in some funky roof lines that might be cause for concern, and suggested that the real issue is more about mass and scale.

Mr. Pember expressed a desire to obtain input from the audience. Ms. Capobianco reiterated that this is a public meeting and not a public hearing, and stated that she is not inclined to take up more meeting time to discuss this any further since the board has to address the more pressing issue of lot size. In response to a question from a member of the audience, Ms. Capobianco explained that the public hearing has not yet been scheduled but will be following completion of the board's discussion. She noted that developers who were in the audience at last week's meeting were allowed the opportunity to speak, and had others been in attendance they also would have been given the chance to do so. She reiterated that the board has one remaining issue to address, and she would like to move forward with doing so. Ms. Poretsky recalled that she had specifically asked at last week's meeting whether town residents would be able to comment. Ms. Capobianco noted that the only matter being discussed by the board is lot size. She expressed a desire to start that conversation, after which it will be determined if audience input is needed. Ms. Gillespie asked if the board can also discuss dimensional regulations. Ms. Joubert recalled that, at last week's meeting, the board members had all agreed to amend the bylaw for duplexes to require a special permit, site plan review, design review, increase the side yard setback to 20 feet, and impose a height restriction. Ms. Gillespie expressed a desire to also discuss frontage, front yard setbacks, and rear yard setbacks. Ms. Joubert voiced her understanding that the board had previously decided not to modify rear yard setbacks after discussing the impacts to septic systems and private wells. She noted that Ms. Barrett had also talked about the impact of changing the front setback and the board had seemed to understand the issue. She reiterated that, when the conversation concluded last week, board members had reached agreement about the five changes (special permit, site plan review, design review, side yard setback, and height restriction) that were to be proposed. Ms. Gillespie commented that she understood that Ms. Joubert was going to look at frontage in the RC and GR districts to try to determine the number of lots having only 100 feet of frontage, and indicated that she would not agree to not considering changes to frontage. Ms. Joubert stated that she had not looked at frontage information and believed she had been asked to look at lot size. Ms. Gillespie reiterated her desire to look at frontage as well.

Ms. Joubert explained that she had looked at lot sizes in the GR and RC districts. She stated that she had not done a full build-out analysis, as it would have taken her several weeks to do so. She noted that she had looked strictly at the number of lots below the parameters she was given, and provided the following results

In the GR district

Total number of lots - 445

Number of lots 15,000 square feet to 25,000 square feet – 120

Number of lots over 25,000 square feet – 231

In the RC district

Total number of lots - 3,245

Number of lots 20,000 square feet to 30,000 square feet – 1,266

Number of lots over 30,000 square feet – 811

Ms. Joubert noted that there are some small lots in these zones that were not included in the count. She also indicated that land-exempt lots (state land, railroad property, housing authority stock, etc.) were not included as they would have skewed the data. She explained that the Juniper Hill Golf Course property, which was divided into 9 lots, was included in the count for the RC zone even though it might slightly skew that data. She noted that each of the Juniper Hill lots would be over 30,000 square feet in size. Ms. Capobianco commented that there appear to be a fair number of lots available in each zone that would meet the proposed lot size increases, so she is confident that increasing the minimum required lot size would not result in an effective prohibition. Ms. Harrison agreed. Mr. Pember voiced his opinion that the board should stick with the five changes agreed to last week and voiced opposition to increasing minimum lot size.

Ms. Capobianco recalled that the original proposal was to increase the minimum required lot size from 20,000 square feet to 30,000 square feet in the RC district and from 15,000 square feet to 25,000 square feet in the GR district. Ms. Joubert noted that these increases were recommended by Ms. Barrett and the board had wanted the analysis to determine whether the increases would result in an effective prohibition of duplexes. Ms. Harrison commented that the concern with increasing lot sizes is the ability to affect scale of the structure that can be put on a lot. She indicated that, as long as increasing lot size will result in limiting size and providing more green space, she is in favor of doing so. Ms. Capobianco recalled that, last year, Mr. Pember had proposed increasing the minimum lot size to 17,000 square feet in the GR district and 22,000 square feet in the RC district, while Ms. Joubert had suggested 22,500 square feet in the GR zone and 30,000 square feet in the RC zone.

Ms. Poretsky indicated that she would be in favor of following Ms. Barrett’s recommendations (25,000 sf in GR and 30,000 sf in RC). She indicated that she had done her own analysis by driving around the neighborhood, prompted by letters from residents on Summer Street voicing concerns about their small lots in the GR district. She stated that, if the minimum lot size were to remain unchanged, she thinks 70% of neighborhood would qualify for duplex development but that number would be reduced to 30% if the board were to adopt Ms. Barrett’s recommendations. She emphasized the importance of doing so and noted that these developments in essence are placing two homes on one lot, so requiring a larger lot makes sense. Ms. Gillespie also agreed with Ms. Barrett’s recommendations.

Ms. Poretsky expressed a desire to also increase the minimum required lot size from 10,000 square feet to 20,000 square feet in the Downtown Neighborhood (DN) and Main Street Residential (MSR) zones, because the small lot sizes in those zones could result in a number of duplexes. Ms. Harrison and Ms. Gillespie agreed. Mr. Pember voiced opposition.

Ms. Capobianco reiterated that an increase in minimum lot size is warranted, given that there appears to be a sufficient number of lots that could be utilized. She indicated that she would be in agreement with Ms. Barrett’s recommendations, which are as follows:

<u>District</u>	<u>current minimum required lot size</u>	<u>proposed minimum required lot size</u>
RC	20,000 square feet	30,000 square feet
GR	15,000 square feet	25,000 square feet

MSR	15,000 square feet	25,000 square feet
DN	10,000 square feet	20,000 square feet

Members of the board agreed, with the exception of Mr. Pember.

Ms. Gillespie explained that, when the board discussed frontage last November, Ms. Joubert and Ms. Barrett had proposed increasing the minimum required frontage in the GR and RC districts from 100 feet to 150 feet, while Mr. Pember suggested no change. She recalled that there were concerns about impacts to certain neighborhoods, like Northgate, so she looked at the entire neighborhood and was surprised to learn how many of those lots have 150 feet of frontage or more. She suggested that the board consider the increases to minimum required frontage recommended by Ms. Joubert and Ms. Barrett.

Ms. Capobianco noted that there was an assumption that lots did not have sufficient frontage but, based on Ms. Gillespie’s information, this does not appear to be the case. In response to a question from Ms. Gillespie, Ms. Joubert indicated that the number of duplexes built in recent years were 3 in 2016, 3 in 2015, 2 in 2014, 3 in 2013, none in 2012, and 2 in 2011. Ms. Poretsky commented that she had looked at the lots on Davis Street and also found that there were numerous lots that have sufficient frontage and large lot sizes, so the proposed increases should not affect them. Ms. Gillespie stated that she had also looked at the lots on Brigham Street and found the case to be the same. In response to a question from Ms. Capobianco, Ms. Poretsky voiced agreement with the increase in minimum required frontage proposed by both Ms. Gillespie and Ms. Judi Barrett. Ms. Harrison agreed, but commented that she would be more comfortable doing so if the board had more data on frontage but noted that town staff was not asked to provide this. Ms. Gillespie stated that this increase in frontage was recommended by Ms. Joubert last year. Mr. Pember suggested that the board consider the question posed by Ms. Barrett last week about whether the board is trying to prohibit duplexes or regulate them. He commented that, if the board is trying to regulate them, it is possible to do so through site plan review, design review, and the special permit process. He noted that there are a minimal number of duplexes being built every year, and the town is not be inundated with them. He voiced his opinion that the board is trying to prohibit duplexes, and stated that he is absolutely opposed to doing so. Ms. Harrison commented that the changes will not result in an effective prohibition and voiced her opinion that setting a baseline is not an unreasonable thing to do. Mr. Pember reiterated that he is not in favor of increasing the minimum required frontage.

Ms. Capobianco confirmed that 4 board members support (Mr. Pember opposed) the proposal to increase the minimum required frontage as follows:

<u>Zone</u>	<u>Proposed minimum frontage</u>
RC	150 feet
GR	150 feet
MSR	no change
DN	100 feet

Ms. Joubert asked the board to confirm that they would like the minimum lot width to be the same as the minimum frontage. Board members agreed, with the exception of Mr. Pember.

Ms. Capobianco asked if the special permitting process for duplexes in the RC district should come before this board. Ms. Joubert expressed a desire to clarify, since draft language provided to Ms. Barrett left duplexes in the RC zone with the ZBA. Ms. Capobianco recalled that the board had wanted special

permits for all duplex developments to come to the Planning Board. Mr. Pember recalled that when the zoning bylaws were revised in 2009, there was a lot of discussion about what jurisdiction both boards would retain and it appeared that the ZBA felt that the Planning Board was trying to put them out of business. Ms. Capobianco noted that the ZBA typically has a full agenda each month, so they have plenty to address. She also commented that, given the small number of these projects historically, the impact should be minimal. Members of the board voiced support for having special permits for duplexes come to the Planning Board.

Ms. Joubert noted that two-family dwellings are currently not allowed in the RA and RB districts. Ms. Gillespie asked if the board wants to consider opening those zones up to two-family development and noted that Ms. Barrett has recommended a minimum lot size of 50,000 square feet and 200 feet of frontage if the board opts to do so. Ms. Harrison suggested that if there has never been an issue with them not being allowed in the past, she sees no reason to do so now. Ms. Joubert noted that there had been some discussion about the fact that only 2 duplexes were built in these zones when they were allowed prior to 2009, so the zoning subcommittee removed them from allowed uses in RA and RB. She also indicated that, since that time, there have been no variance requests for duplex developments in these districts. Ms. Capobianco suggested that the matter can be addressed through the Master Plan process, if needed. Mr. Pember agreed that there does not seem to be a demand for duplexes in the RA and RB zones, so he would be in favor of leaving it as is.

Ms. Joubert recalled that all board members had previously agreed to increasing the side setback to 20 feet. Ms. Poretsky expressed a change of opinion after doing further analyses. She noted that 30 feet of setback is lost when putting two homes on a single lot, and many of the recent duplex developments resulted in excessive pavement in the front yard. She suggested that it would be preferable to have driveways along the side of the lot and retain some landscaping and character in the front yard. She also commented that the modest increase of 5 feet on each side is not sufficient, given the scale of these structures. Ms. Joubert commented that she cannot advise the board on this matter since she is not familiar with the turning radius and whether it is possible to put a driveway on each side. Ms. Poretsky recalled that the duplex project proposed on Whitney Street had limited frontage and the turning radius was going to be tight, so having a larger side setback would provide more room to accommodate the required turning radius. Ms. Joubert suggested that the board might want an engineering analysis to address that question. Ms. Capobianco commented that the objective can be accomplished through the various processes that the board is now requiring applicants to go through, where issues of this type can be adequately addressed. She also stated that she does not believe it is entirely appropriate for the Planning Board to regulate driveway location. In response to a request from Ms. Harrison for professional input, Mr. Litchfield explained that the town would prefer a single driveway for duplexes whenever possible, especially on busy roadways like Whitney Street. He also explained that the turning radius for a car is about 30 feet, so the inside radius needs to be 20 feet to make the turn. He stated that these projects typically have a 20-foot wide parking space off to the side on the driveway for residents to back into and turn around. In response to a question from Ms. Capobianco about increasing the setback to 30 feet, Mr. Litchfield noted that it would still be tight with 150 feet of frontage but it should be able to make it work at 20 feet. Ms. Joubert noted that the Police Chief would also prefer a single driveway as it would require fewer curb cuts.

Ms. Gillespie asked if the board can impose a restriction of a single curb cut and applicants can seek a waiver through the site plan process if they need more. Ms. Joubert explained that the board has a common driveway regulation, so doing so would complicate that. She questioned whether it is possible for the board to require a duplex to have a shared driveway, and indicated that sight distance and design would need to be considered. In response to Ms. Gillespie's question about requiring a single

curb cut, Ms. Joubert noted that the new duplex project on East Main Street that has one driveway on Route 20 and another on East Main Street would not have been possible. Ms. Gillespie suggested that the applicant could seek a waiver for that. Ms. Joubert noted that she is not comfortable doing zoning on the fly, and stated that it would be difficult for her to make a recommendation whether this proposal would work or not. Ms. Capobianco reiterated that the proposed changes to require developers to go through design review, site plan review, and the special permit process should provide sufficient ability to control duplex projects. She also commented that a developer would likely not put in two driveways unless there is a need to do so, given the added expense. Mr. Litchfield reiterated a desire for a single driveway whenever possible to minimize the number of curb cuts. Mr. Pember questioned whether this could be addressed in rules and regulations, which can be done after Town Meeting. Ms. Capobianco suggested that it could be addressed during the design review process. Mr. Litchfield commented that, if a requirement for a special permit for duplexes gets adopted, a single driveway will be one of the recommendations he makes on a regular basis.

Ms. Poretsky voiced her preference for a 30 foot setback on each side. Ms. Joubert noted that town staff had recommended a 20 foot side setback last year, and Ms. Gillespie recalled that this was Ms. Barrett's recommendation as well. Ms. Capobianco indicated that a 20 foot side setback is what the board had agreed to during last week's meeting. After some discussion, a majority of four board members voiced support for the proposed 20 foot setback (Ms. Poretsky prefers 30).

Ms. Harrison suggested that the audience be given an opportunity to provide input.

Ms. Poretsky asked if the board is going to follow Ms. Barrett's recommendations about maximum lot coverage and minimum open space, which she altered by 5%. Ms. Capobianco noted that the board had decided last week not to do so. Ms. Joubert commented that we do not currently have any regulations in place about minimum open space for a single family lots size, and it would be difficult at this point to make a recommendation. She did recall that Ms. Barrett had made a recommendation. Ms. Poretsky explained that Ms. Barrett had suggested an increase in the minimum open space from 30% to 35%. Ms. Joubert mentioned that the information that Ms. Barrett had provided for consideration this evening did not include any requirements for open space. Ms. Harrison suggested that maximum lot coverage and minimum open space can be covered through setbacks, and Ms. Joubert agreed. Ms. Harrison stated that the board had made several decisions at their meeting last week and had in mind what was going to be addressed this week, and she would not be in favor of making any rash decisions. Ms. Poretsky indicated that the board can always revisit the issue should it find it to be a problem.

Ms. Joubert asked if the board would like to carry the 35 foot height restrictions through all residential zones. Mr. Pember stated that he does not believe it is necessary in RA and RB, both of which have substantial lot sizes, but he would like to apply it to the other residential zones. In response to a question from Ms. Capobianco about height potential if a limit is not imposed, Mr. Federico indicated that buildings are typically three stories (36 feet) and a custom house of more than three stories would trigger compliance with commercial code and he does not foresee that happening. In response to a question from Ms. Capobianco about whether there should be a height limit in RA or RB, both Mr. Federico and Mr. Litchfield agreed that there is no need.

Ms. Gillespie asked if the board is going to include maximum lot coverage. Ms. Joubert stated that it is currently addressed in the bylaw and will remain as it is today. Ms. Joubert reiterated that the board had agreed to a 20 foot side setback last week. With regards to height restrictions in RA and RB, Ms. Gillespie and Ms. Poretsky expressed a desire to impose a 35 foot limit. In response to a question from Ms. Harrison about the process should someone want to build a dwelling greater than 35 feet high, Mr.

Federico stated that a variance would likely be necessary. Given that, Ms. Harrison also agreed to the 35 foot height restriction in all residential districts. Mr. Pember voiced opposition. Ms. Capobianco commented that she is inclined to agree with Mr. Pember since minimum lots sizes and setbacks are so much greater in the RA and RB districts. She agreed to put forward the proposal to include the restriction for all residential zones since three board members are in favor.

Ms. Poretsky noted that multifamily dwellings are also allowed in the DN zone but the minimum required lot size is only 10,000 square feet. She asked if the board should consider increasing it to 20,000 square feet to be consistent with what will be required for duplexes. Ms. Joubert explained that multifamily development requires 10,000 square feet for the first two units and an additional 4500 square feet for each additional unit. Ms. Poretsky suggested modifying the regulation to require 20,000 square feet for the first two units and the additional 4500 square feet for each additional unit. Some members of the board agreed. Mr. Pember questioned whether the change would result in a prohibition of multifamily dwellings in the district. Ms. Poretsky commented that she does not believe it would, and noted that the DN area contains some larger lots. Ms. Joubert explained that the purpose of the DN district was to encourage smaller houses on smaller lots, such as Tony Abu's development of four single-family homes on Hudson Street. She also stated that there are very few lots in the district. Mr. Pember suggested that there would be minimal activity, given the limited number of lots, and suggested that no change is needed. Ms. Gillespie expressed a desire to address it next year and most members of the board agreed.

Ms. Poretsky discussed zoning and definitions, and noted that the bylaw contains reference to both multifamily and single family dwelling, attached (page 728 of the regulation). She believes that #2 was supposed to mean a townhouse and # 5 was to mean multifamily that is more like garden style apartments with shared entry and shared hallways. She explained that when she had discussed the issue with Ms. Barrett, she agreed that they should not be able to be used interchangeably and suggested that the sentence under #5 be modified to read "shall" instead of "may". Ms. Poretsky recalled that the applicant for the project on King Street had wanted to build townhouses but, since they are not allowed, he had modified his application to use the term "multifamily dwelling" instead. Ms. Harrison agreed that two identically designed buildings should not have two different definitions. Ms. Capobianco asked if the goal for King Street is not to allow anything to be developed there, or to allow something and require compliance with the rules in the course of development. She commented that she does not believe the board can prevent people from developing their land. She also questioned why the board would try to exclude a project that fits. Ms. Poretsky recalled that when the project went through ZBA, she believed it did not fit. Ms. Poretsky reiterated her desire to modify the language as proposed by Ms. Barrett, but other members of the board did not support the idea. Ms. Gillespie suggested that this could also be revisited at a later date. Ms. Poretsky emphasized that she was merely trying to eliminate confusion for the board and for developers.

Ms. Capobianco invited audience members to comment. She reminded them that this is a public meeting and not a public hearing. She asked them to keep their comments short and to the point, and not be repetitive of one another.

Carolyn Harrington, 67 Summer Street, explained that she grew up in town and raised her family here. She noted that a group of Summer Street residents had sent letters to the board voicing concerns about duplexes. She noted issues with builders wanting to squeeze a huge duplex onto a small plot of land, and emphasized that this is not what town residents want to see. She requested that the board consider what the residents want and not worry about what builders want. She commented that duplexes do not fit on Summer Street, and asked board members why two-family homes are needed.

John Garton, 39 Pleasant Street, noted that he had moved to town 8 years ago and chose to settle in Northborough because of the excellent school system and other positive factors. He stated that, although he currently lives in a multifamily development, he is not here to argue in favor of expanding them. He indicated that he does not see the need to do so but, as someone who has lived in many different towns and cities, he would like to emphasize that the urban fabric of a community is only second to location for attracting residents. He noted that Northborough has many things going for it in that respect, and suggested that development of 2 to 4 duplexes a year can add up. He explained that the task for the board in terms of protecting residents and maintaining the fabric of the community is important.

Carolyn Guarino, 4 Park Street, stated that she shares the concerns voiced by Ms. Harrington. She asked who decides about duplexes and what the town is going to look like, and wondered if it will be up to those sitting on the Master Plan Committee. Ms. Capobianco explained that there are three members of the Planning Board who will be on the Master Plan Committee, along with citizens and members of other town boards. She noted that there will be a series of public meetings and public hearings that will provide an opportunity for members of the public to participate and have their voice heard.

Ms. Joubert revisited the issue of the side setback. She noted that there was a footnote to the proposed 20 foot side setback that would allow the Board of Appeals to approve a reduction to 15 feet on one side so long as the 5 feet is added on the other side so that the sum of the setback shall not be less than 40 feet. Mr. Pember commented that a site's topography may be such that this is the only practical way to do it. Ms. Joubert stated that the board can also address this by way of a waiver instead of sending an applicant to the Board of Appeals. Members of the board agreed that they would like to keep the matter with the Planning Board.

Ms. Joubert confirmed that the board has agreed to propose the following:

Minimum lot sizes to be increased to

- 30,000 square feet in the RC district
- 25,000 square feet in the GR district
- 25,000 square feet in the MSR district
- 20,000 square feet in the DN district

Minimum Lot frontage and minimum lot width to be

- 150 feet in the RC and GR districts
- 100 feet in the MSR and DN districts

Special permit granting authority shall be the Planning Board for all 4 districts (RC, GR, MSR, and DN)

Side setback for duplex developments to be increased to 20 feet in all four residential zones (RC, GR, MSR, DN) and will include a footnote about the waiver for reduction of setback on one side

Height restriction of 35 feet in all residential zones

Board members agreed that this was the decision.

Tom Reardon, 70 Sunset Drive, voiced his understanding about concerns regarding scale, which he believes is a problem of poor design. He indicated that he would be in favor of Mr. Pember's approach to regulate duplex developments through site plan review, design review, and the special permit process. He commented that he does not think that increases in the minimum lot size and setbacks are warranted, and suggested that the town may be opening itself up to unintended consequences. He

stated that construction of 2 to 3 duplexes a year is not dramatic, and too many restrictions may result in totally suppressing things. He urged the board not to have widespread dimensional restrictions that could prove problematic. Ms. Harrison recalled that, at last week's meeting, Mr. Reardon had agreed with the proposal if there would not be changes to front and rear setbacks. Mr. Reardon confirmed that he did, but noted that the board is now increasing minimum lot sizes as well. He reiterated his opinion that the board is over-reacting by imposing new dimensional regulations.

Continued Zoning Discussion for 2018 Town Meeting, Proposed bylaws for Recreational Marijuana

Ms. Capobianco indicated that the proposed bylaw language has not changed since it was reviewed by the board during last week's meeting, at which time she believes the board members were in agreement but Ms. Poretsky had asked for time to review them more fully. In response to a question from Ms. Poretsky about whether the language had been reviewed by Town Counsel, Ms. Joubert indicated that Town Counsel had written the bylaws. Members of the board agreed unanimously with the proposed bylaws as written.

Minutes of the Meeting of December 5, 2017 - Ms. Joubert noted that Ms. Harrison had added a comment that is reflected in the copy before the board tonight. George Pember made a motion to approve the Minutes of the Meeting of December 5, 2017 as amended. Leslie Harrison seconded; motion carries by unanimous vote.

Master Plan Committee – Ms. Joubert explained that the target date for the first meeting of the Master Plan Committee is February 28, 2018.

Upcoming Planning Board meetings – Ms. Joubert noted that the next Planning Board meeting is scheduled for March 6, 2018 and will include the public hearing for the proposed zoning revisions and the project at 172 Bearfoot Road.

Ms. Joubert explained that the board is also scheduled to meet on March 20, 2018. Based on availability of board members and the need to conclude public hearings before Town Meeting, the board agreed to move the March 20th meeting to March 13th, if needed.

In response to a question from Ms. Gillespie, Mr. Litchfield stated that the Board of Selectmen will vote to close the warrant for Town Meeting on March 12th.

Ms. Poretsky asked about process, since the board will hold public hearings after the articles are submitted. She commented that this gives the appearance that board will listen to comments but changes can't be made. Ms. Joubert explained closing the warrant by the Board of Selectmen and holding public hearings on the proposed zoning have always been in this time frame and that if any changes are desired as the result of the public hearing process, they can be addressed within the motion at Town Meeting as long as it is within the parameters of the proposal. She noted that, if it is outside of what was advertised, people can always make amendments from the floor.

Meeting adjourned at 9:50PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Elaine Rowe
Board Secretary