



TOWN OF NORTHBOROUGH PLANNING BOARD

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

Approved 2.4.2020

Planning Board Meeting Minutes December 3, 2019

Members in attendance: Kerri Martinek, Chair; Amy Poretsky, Vice Chair; Mille Milton; Michelle Gillespie

Others present: Kathy Joubert, Town Planner; Sarah Adams, Central Massachusetts Regional Planning Commission;

Chair Kerri Martinek called the meeting to order at 7:00pm.

Continued Public Hearing for 425 Whitney Street Special Permit Site Plan Approval and Special Permit per Groundwater Protection Overlay District

Applicant:	Steris A.S.T.
Engineer:	VHB
Date Filed:	September 17, 2019
Decision Due:	90 days from close of hearing

Ms. Martinek noted that the applicant has requested a continuance to the December 12, 2019 Planning Board meeting. Ms. Joubert explained that the applicant is still gathering information to address the board's request in their letter dated November 15, 2019.

Amy Poretsky made a motion to continue the hearing to December 12, 2019 at 7:00PM. Michelle Gillespie seconded; vote unanimous

Continued Discussion with CMRPC RE: Zoning Bylaws for Solar Energy Systems and Hazardous Waste Facilities

Hazardous Waste Facilities Bylaw - Ms. Adams stated that she did not provide a revised draft of the hazardous waste facilities bylaw. She also noted that there may be some additional mapping exercises needed to ensure that there will not be an issue with allowing these facilities only in the industrial area as was previously discussed.

Solar Bylaw – Ms. Adams explained that she had provided board members with a copy of the revised document that incorporates edits based on discussions at the last meeting and input received from board members and includes the addition of the following:

- a definition for small scale solar systems
- small scale solar systems as an accessory use in the Residential District Use Table
- small scale solar systems as an accessory use in the Commercial and Industrial District Use Tables
- language about payment in lieu of taxes
- language about the provision of a draft agreement
- language specific to plowing access roadways and other Operations & Maintenance items
- a use variance clause

Ms. Adams mentioned that she had also revised the definition of small scale solar to be based on square footage instead of capacity, but noted that Ms. Poretsky had changed it back to capacity in her recently submitted edits, so this will need to be further discussed.

Ms. Martinek recalled that the board had also expressed a desire to require that landscape buffers be maintained in perpetuity. Ms. Adams noted that this is captured under Operations and Maintenance.

Ms. Adams explained that the board had discussed imposing a maximum lot coverage limit of 50% but did not address how they would like to define it. She mentioned that her draft language, provided for the board's consideration, pertains specifically to the area of the solar panels and does not include anything outside of the panel footprint itself.

Ms. Poretsky discussed her concerns about the definitions and limits and had gone back to a capacity limit for solar projects. She noted that a large scale project is defined as 250kw and voiced her opinion that a limit of 25,000 square feet for a small scale system in a residential area is too large. She explained that she had found model zoning from the state that suggests that small scale is 1750 square feet of surface area or less, or 10kw or less, and 25,000 square feet does not appear to be small scale. She noted that 25,000 square feet could be the size of an entire lot in some of our residential areas. She indicated that, after looking at other solar bylaw and several other models, she decided to go back to the 250kw since it is what she found in the majority of the information she found.

Ms. Adams explained that she had looked into what would be typical for a 250kw system and found it would be larger than 25,000 square feet. She suggested that putting the limit back to 250kw would likely not sufficiently limit the size so it may be better to make the system capacity or area limits smaller.

Ms. Poretsky discussed her concerns that 25,000 square feet is too large. She noted that, from a class she has attended, it appears that most towns do not have ground-mounted systems in residential neighborhoods. She also noted that towns allow them only in industrial areas if they have enough industrial sites available for development. She voiced her opinion that a 25,000 square foot limit for small scale systems would open up all of Residential C (RC) for commercial solar facilities. She emphasized that she is in favor of allowing residents to have solar on their

property but the system should only be large enough to power the house. She expressed a desire to prohibit commercial solar farms in residential neighborhoods and suggested that the way the definition is written would allow it. Ms. Adam noted that solar is listed as an accessory use, so it would need to be accessory to something else on the property and not a stand-alone use. Mr. Poretsky reiterated her opinion that 25,000 square feet is too large.

In response to questions from Ms. Gillespie about recommendations to impose a 25,000 square foot area limit instead of using a kilowatt minimum or maximum, Ms. Adams recommended keeping the limit at 25,000 square feet instead of 250kw. Ms. Adams stated that she does not have a preference but noted that the discussion at the last meeting centered around the physical size of the system, with a suggestion to switch to a square footage metric instead of energy capacity. She also noted that a square footage metric is a bit more consistent since technology is continually evolving and the ability to generate a higher capacity may fluctuate greatly in the future. Ms. Gillespie noted that there may be some unintended consequences for Town Meeting since systems could change considerably over time. Ms. Adams commented that, generally speaking, she expects that we will see capacity increase as panels become more efficient but we could also see footprints enlarge through the use of trackers, etc. She suggested that it will be easier to predict what might come before the board if we impose a limit based on footprint size instead of energy generation.

In response to continued concerns about system size, Ms. Adams asked if the board would like to include an intermediate size in the bylaw. Ms. Poretsky asked where intermediate systems would be zoned. Ms. Joubert noted that this would depend on the board and suggested that a mixture would be more difficult than maintaining square footage limits across all sizes. She also asked Ms. Adams to provide examples of a small scale system that is not a residential application. Ms. Adams stated that, though they are generally for homes, she has seen a lot of Water Districts with them. Ms. Gillespie asked about small scale ground-mounted systems for schools. Ms. Adams stated that many schools are doing parking lot canopy structures, which would fall within the small scale use. Ms. Joubert noted that this would be something the town would want to promote rather than as an accessory use. She also voiced her opinion that, since a small scale system is an accessory use, someone couldn't simply buy a residential parcel and install a small scale system. Ms. Poretsky noted that her residential lot is 45,000 square feet, so her entire back yard could be filled with enough solar panels to generate power that she could sell back to the grid.

Ms. Poretsky recalled discussions that the CMRPC session where people from western communities indicated that there are a lot of solar systems in neighborhoods. Ms. Adams recalled that the conversation primarily centered around the Town of Ware and, though she was not familiar with their bylaw, she believes they may allow solar as a primary use in residential districts.

Ms. Martinek asked if imposing a maximum lot coverage of 50% would allay concerns. Ms. Poretsky voiced uncertainty. She mentioned that, in another informational session she attended, it appeared that communities were banning solar in residential areas except for

rooftop installations but not as large as 25,000 square feet. In response to a question from Ms. Martinek, Ms. Adams confirmed that rooftop installations are small scale and would be an accessory use. She noted that the more complicated issue is how to permit ground mounted solar as an accessory use. She also mentioned that residential rooftop installations are typically 8-10kw. Ms. Poretsky suggested that the bylaw could include more definitions to allow us to locate these systems properly.

In response to a question from Ms. Martinek about whether the primary concern is that too much of a residential lot could be dedicated to solar that could be sold back to the grid, Ms. Poretsky confirmed that is her concern. She noted that Framingham's bylaw for commercial ground-mounted solar systems requires a minimum of 4 acres and does not address any in neighborhoods other than a sentence to prohibit large scale systems in all residential zones. She also noted that the bylaw did not even address small scale. She voiced her opinion that solar should be allowed by right on roofs. Ms. Joubert mentioned that residents also have solar in their yards. Ms. Poretsky reiterated that she would like them to be smaller than 25,000 square feet.

Ms. Adams cautioned the board about adding medium scale to the bylaw. In response to her question about thresholds the board would be comfortable with, Ms. Poretsky expressed a desire to leave large scale at 25,000 square feet, and choose limits for both medium and small scale. She also questioned where solar might go on municipal lots and asked if it should be noted in a table anywhere in the bylaw. Ms. Joubert explained that there is discussion about potentially adding solar panels to the water garage in town. She explained that, though the use is exempt, town staff has advised the Water Department that they need to go through Site Plan Review. Ms. Gillespie expressed a desire to allow for carport installations in town. Ms. Joubert agreed that carport installations in parking lots would be the preference.

In response to questions from Ms. Martinek about where board members would and would not want to see solar, Ms. Gillespie indicated that she would be in favor of allowing rooftop installations in smaller neighborhoods (Residential C and General Residential). She noted that for the larger lots, especially those further out on Green Street and Howard Street where some terrain does not allow for building construction, larger ground-mounted solar systems might make sense and the area is more appropriate for them. She also stated that she would not like to take away the opportunity for solar in the industrial and highway business districts. She indicated that the town will be addressing possible rezoning in the Southwest Cutoff area at some point, and this area might provide an opportunity for solar.

Ms. Joubert noted that the bylaw currently only allows for large scale solar in the industrial district, which mirrors what was originally proposed in 2014, and small scale would be allowed in all business districts as well as the industrial district.

Ms. Milton agreed with Ms. Gillespie that, while we do not want to see large solar installations in the downtown area, they may be appropriate for larger parcels of land where they will not impact others or on under-utilized farmland.

Ms. Poretsky commented that she would not want to see commercial properties eaten up by solar facilities, given their value and the revenue they provide for the town, so it would make sense to limit them to rooftop or canopy installations only in those areas.

Ms. Martinek recalled discussions about solar facilities claiming exemptions so that they are not required to pay taxes. Ms. Adams noted that this is a state issue and encouraged board members to write to their legislators.

Ms. Joubert asked if it is possible to stipulate that small scale solar can only be rooftop or canopy installations. Ms. Adams confirmed that it is but since we already have small ground-mounted systems in town, it would be difficult to tell residents that they cannot have a small ground-mounted system on their property. She voiced her opinion that a better approach would be to have a smaller threshold for small scale solar. In response to a question from Ms. Joubert about needing to add medium scale solar to the bylaw, Ms. Adams indicated that the town could allow that everything in excess of the agreed upon threshold for small scale solar facilities would be large scale. Ms. Joubert voiced a preference to do so.

Ms. Poretsky expressed concerns about increases in power generation as technology evolves. Ms. Adams asked if it really matters if the board is more concerned about the footprint. Ms. Poretsky mentioned that she would not want to see someone operating a commercial utility business from their house. Ms. Adams stated that this concern can certainly be addressed, if necessary.

Ms. Poretsky also recalled complaints about noise impacts and risks expressed at the recent CMRPC session. She voiced support for anyone who wants to use solar for their own residence but is concerned about potential visual impact on neighbors.

Audio was lost for about 40 seconds.

Regarding residential solar installations as an accessory use, Ms. Joubert related the issue of chicken coops being an accessory use to a residence and mentioned that nobody can stop you from doing that since it is an accessory use, but if the accessory use becomes the main use of the property, it has crossed over from an accessory use to a commercial use. She noted that the probability of that happening is very low, and the same would apply to solar facilities. She voiced her opinion that there is not enough land in General Residential (GR) or Residential C (RC) to allow a resident to go beyond powering their own home. Ms. Milton asked if it is possible to designate thresholds for both land area and kilowatt output. Ms. Adams stated that it is but cautioned the board about doing so. She suggested that the bylaw can impose a limit of square footage or kilowatt threshold, whichever is less.

Ms. Martinek asked if the board can allow small scale solar installations in residential areas by permit. Ms. Joubert voiced a desire not to do so, as this would require anyone wanting to install solar panels for their home to come to the board for a special permit. Ms. Poretsky asked if it is

possible to do so if the system exceeds a certain size, and reiterated concerns because of the many complaints voiced by people in residential areas at the CMRPC session. Ms. Adams recalled that many of those residents were from the Town of Ware, who had allowed solar as a principle use in residential districts and now has a moratorium on solar while they revisit those bylaws. Ms. Poretsky mentioned that a woman from Leicester had also mentioned problems they encountered and had recommended looking at their bylaw.

Ms. Gillespie suggested that, if the board is seeking to be more restrictive for small scale solar to protect some of the neighborhoods, it might be advisable to add intermediate scale systems; otherwise, there will be too big of a gap. She also noted the need to allow for other areas with larger lots that can sustain larger projects. In response to a question from Ms. Adams about whether the board would prefer to allow by right or special permit, Ms. Gillespie stated that she would not be in favor of requiring a special permit for a rooftop installation on a residence. Ms. Joubert noted that some residents have ground-mounted systems because of roof limitations. Ms. Poretsky indicated that she would still like to allow them by special permit to prevent a situation where a resident might install the panels on the neighbor's side of their property. Ms. Joubert asked board members if their desire is to issue special permits for residents to have solar panels at their homes. Ms. Poretsky confirmed that she would want to do so in the case of a large system. Ms. Martinek noted that site plan approval is in place for any large-scale solar facility. She also suggested that the board would not want to permit for a small system for personal use but does wish to protect abutters. She expressed a desire to find a way to ensure that we don't end up requiring approvals for all solar facilities but also does not want to leave a loophole. She questioned whether including an intermediate tier that would require approval makes sense. In response to a question from Ms. Martinek about the typical size for a rooftop system, Ms. Adams indicated that the typical residential system is less than 10kw.

Ms. Martinek commented that, while she does not want to complicate the issue, she understands the concern about loopholes and would not want to see the neighbors upset.

Board members discussed threshold options and lot coverage restrictions for various sized systems.

Ms. Poretsky suggested that it would be better to get residents' opinions now rather than have people upset afterwards. She also emphasized that she would want to avoid presenting something that would result in residents shooting down the proposal in its entirety. Ms. Joubert recalled comments from the 2014 Town Meeting that seemed to indicate that town residents did not agree with allowing solar in only the industrial district and found the proposed bylaw to be too limiting.

In response to questions from Ms. Poretsky about where the issue stands today, Ms. Joubert noted that solar panels on homes are allowed by right, residents continue to install them, and there have never been any complaints with the lack of a bylaw. In addition, she noted that the town has not seen residential properties being heavily developed.

Ms. Martinek suggested that the board address the issue of large-scale solar facilities. Ms. Joubert suggested that the most recent draft provided at this meeting be reviewed in depth, given the extensive comments provided by Ms. Poretsky.

Ms. Poretsky discussed her suggested edits and the reasoning behind each. She noted that Framingham had recently revised their bylaws and she found them to be extremely good. She mentioned that she had compared Framingham's bylaw with ours and incorporated some language from their bylaw to enhance ours.

Ms. Joubert explained that she was not familiar with Framingham's bylaw but understands that they recently went from being a town to a city, so they can now go to City Council to change their bylaws. She cautioned the board about the dangers of relying on information from one or two towns without knowing the history of how they arrived at their bylaw. Ms. Gillespie agreed. She noted that Framingham is not like Northborough and indicated that she would be more comfortable with looking at bylaws from Westborough or Hudson since those municipalities are much more similar in nature to ours. She also stated that she would not want to take a proposal to Town Meeting only to return the following year to make revisions. Ms. Poretsky explained that Framingham's bylaw is more about protections and avoiding undesirable impacts to wildlife corridors and stormwater management, which were components of Northborough's Master Plan so she thought it worthwhile to include that language.

Ms. Adams suggested that, if the board wishes to go through the exercise of looking at bylaws from other towns, it should look at those that are not brand new in order to utilize something that has a successful track record. She stated that, while it is good to include recommendations and aspirational pieces, it is important to have a bylaw with some "teeth". She emphasized that it would not be worth it to include paragraphs if they are not really applicable or will not result in influencing what people are going to do.

Ms. Martinek asked about sample or model bylaws. Ms. Adams indicated that solar is very personal and specific to a community and what works for one does not necessarily work for another. Ms. Joubert recalled that, when the original bylaw was drafted for the 2014 Town Meeting, the board had used a combination of the state's model bylaw and those of neighboring communities (Westborough, Grafton, Shrewsbury). She noted that one of the main purposes for engaging Ms. Adams was to bring in an expert of the topic. She explained that Ms. Adams looked at the original draft bylaw and updated the language to reflect changes in the solar industry in recent years.

Ms. Joubert referenced the suggestion to include language about requiring a Knox Box and noted that this is already required by the Police and Fire Departments. She commented that including it in the solar bylaw is redundant and it is already a standard practice. She also indicated that, once the board reaches a decision about the language of the bylaw, it will be reviewed by the Police Chief, Fire Chief, and Building Inspector as well as an industry expert who Mr. Litchfield has work with in the past.

Ms. Adams referenced section D. #6 and #8 in the document from Ms. Poretsky and suggested that the board get input from the Fire Chief and Police Chief about whether they want to require it or prefer to work with applicants to address it on an as-needed basis.

In response to a question from Ms. Adams about whether the board wants to require an emergency response plan or leave it to the discretion of the Fire Chief or Police Chief, Ms. Martinek voiced a preference for the latter. Ms. Poretsky voiced concern about how much knowledge the Fire Chief has about solar and suggested having a discussion with him.

Ms. Milton asked about the fire risk with solar systems. Ms. Adams noted that there is a perception that there is a high risk, but she is not sure if it is valid. She explained that she has permitted many solar facilities and only has knowledge of one fire caused by employee error during construction. She voiced her opinion that there is not a particularly high risk of fire.

In response to a question from Ms. Gillespie about who the approving board will be, Ms. Joubert stated that large scale solar must be allowed by right in some district since Northborough is a Green Community. She explained that the proposal is to allow the use by right in the industrial district with a requirement to go through the site plan approval process with the Planning Board. Ms. Poretsky noted that the language in the bylaw references "site plan approval authority" and voiced a preference to specify it is the Planning Board. Members of the board agreed.

Ms. Gillespie asked if it is standard to ask for a fully executed mutual agreement between the utility companies to be provided. Ms. Adams confirmed that it is, but noted that many companies have modified it to require proof of utility notification (application) rather than the executed agreement because there is a hefty price tag for interconnection that developers don't want to sign until they have permits in hand. She voiced her opinion that proof of notification should suffice.

Ms. Poretsky asked about the need to include language in the bylaw requiring immediate compliance with the bylaw for systems that may have originally been off the grid that subsequently go on the grid. Ms. Adams voiced her opinion that this is not necessary.

Ms. Poretsky asked about the dimensional setbacks and if those stipulated in the proposed bylaw are what is required in our industrial zone. Ms. Adams indicated that they are what was proposed in the 2014 draft and she did not change that. Ms. Joubert voiced her opinion that they mimic the setbacks for wireless facilities but agreed to check and advise. Ms. Poretsky suggested that board members review the details to determine if they are in agreement with them.

Ms. Poretsky recommended that the board consider requiring more than a 20 foot side setback. Ms. Adams reiterated that half of the dedicated setback area is required to be vegetated or screened in some manner, so she does not believe that increasing the setback will have any impact on decreasing the visual impacts. Ms. Joubert recalled that there had been considerable discussion about setbacks and fences in 2014 and part of the conclusion was that an abutter in

the district expects that there will be another commercial or industrial use on an abutting lot. She also noted that there are setbacks on both sides of the property line, so this should provide sufficient distance.

Ms. Poretsky discussed her concerns with lighting, specifically with the use of the term “reasonable” since it is highly subjective. She asked if the board might prefer to set a height limit. Ms. Joubert suggested that this should be treated like any other use in the zoning bylaw. She noted that the bylaw does not now require light poles to be of a particular height. She also mentioned that the term “reasonable” is used throughout zoning bylaws to allow for the board to determine what is reasonable based on what makes sense for the particular situation. Ms. Adams mentioned that there are typically not a lot of lights installed for solar projects.

Ms. Martinek recalled that the board had wanted to stipulate that landscape buffers be maintained in perpetuity. Ms. Adams reiterated that this should be included in the Operations and Maintenance section. Board members agreed that they would want the language to include the stipulation “in perpetuity”.

Ms. Poretsky suggested that language about utility connections be more strongly worded, especially if the project is located in a residential neighborhood. She also expressed a desire to require developers to demonstrate why they were unable to install them underground. Ms. Adams agreed with the revised language as proposed, but emphasized that developers will likely find underground installations to be cost prohibitive.

Ms. Adams agreed to revise the safety section and rework the language based on discussions about consulting with the Police and Fire Departments and the Emergency Response Plan. She indicated that she will also add a sentence about nuisance and noise impacts in the environmental standards language.

Ms. Poretsky asked about whether maximum coverage will apply only to the panels or to all structures like batteries, etc. Members of the board discussed various options. Ms. Adams noted that she typically sees a maximum coverage of 50% applied to just the panels because facilities are being proposed on parcels that already include other structures and including everything would be too prohibitive. Ms. Joubert explained that there is not much open industrial land remaining in town and voiced her opinion that, should solar come to Northborough, it will likely be installed on lots that already have an existing use. She suggested that the original proposal that allowed for up to 50% of land area to be occupied by solar panels is reasonable.

Ms. Poretsky expressed concerns about excessive tree clearing. Ms. Joubert reminded board members that developers must conform to existing regulations. Ms. Adams commented that, if interested parties have available rooftops or parking lots, they will install there since the state makes it worthwhile to do so.

Ms. Joubert indicated that Mr. Litchfield has not yet had an opportunity to review the draft so does not yet have any comments to provide on the stormwater management section. Ms. Adams recalled that Mr. Litchfield had mentioned that it might be a bit redundant with the Planning Board rules and regulations. She noted that she had reviewed the site plan approval section and is more comfortable leaving the language as drafted but left it up to the board to decide how to proceed. Ms. Joubert agreed to obtain Mr. Litchfield's input.

Ms. Poretsky discussed the issue of decommissioning and noted that other bylaws include a stipulation allowing the town to step in and address decommissioning if the operator fails to do so within a specified period of time. Ms. Adams stated that she is not sure this is needed but sees no harm in including it. In response to a question from Ms. Gillespie about the legality of doing so, Ms. Adams voiced her opinion that it would be allowed. Members of the board expressed a desire to include it in the bylaw. Ms. Joubert suggested that, should this situation ever arise, she is confident that whoever holds the surety will ensure that the decommissioning is done appropriately to enable them to recover their money.

Ms. Martinek noted that Ms. Adams had explained that a typical residential rooftop installation would be approximately 10,000 square feet for a 100kw system, with a ground-mounted system in the yard likely not much larger. Ms. Martinek asked if defining a small scale project of 10,000 square feet or less and a large scale as anything larger than that would work. She also suggested allowing large scale solar in the industrial areas by right and in commercial districts by special permit. She expressed a desire to avoid requiring residents to obtain a permit for solar power for their homes. Ms. Poretsky commented that a large system may not be appropriate in commercial areas. Ms. Martinek noted that, if a project does not fit and fails to meet the criteria, it would not be approved. In response to questions from Ms. Adams about where and how the board would like to allow solar, Ms. Gillespie stated that she would be in favor of allowing large scale solar in the Highway Business and Industrial districts by right and in the other commercial districts by special permit. Ms. Joubert noted that there are not many parcels available in the Highway Business district. Ms. Martinek mentioned that she would like to hear from town residents about the Residential A and B districts.

Members of the board agreed that it would be beneficial to consider Ms. Martinek's proposal for defining system sizes. Ms. Joubert noted that solar installations in the area are somewhat old, with some being rather small. She offered to obtain information about nearby installations and how they translate into square footage to enable board members to get a better visual.

Ms. Martinek requested that board members think about using the model and working through different scenarios and examples to determine if the approach will work or might result in unanticipated consequences.

Ms. Poretsky voiced a desire to see, on paper, what a small scale accessory use might look like on various sized parcels.

Ms. Martinek asked about ownership change. Ms. Adams explained that she had included a requirement for notification in the event of an ownership change since there is a high likelihood with solar projects. Ms. Martinek discussed ownership changes in general, and asked if new business owners are required to meet with town staff to review the site plan and conditions. Ms. Joubert indicated that there is no such requirement in the zoning bylaw. Ms. Martinek asked Ms. Joubert if such a requirement would be warranted for a solar project. Ms. Adams noted that the draft currently stipulates that any new owner must agree to all conditions in writing. Ms. Joubert stated that the language as written is sufficient.

Ms. Milton voiced her opinion that the draft is very comprehensive as written. Ms. Gillespie agreed.

Ms. Joubert reiterated that the board has exceeded the time that Ms. Adams was contracted for and agreed to investigate options for additional work. She stated that she has asked Ms. Adams to attend the board's first meeting in January for further discussion. Ms. Gillespie suggested that board members can look at bylaws for neighboring towns on their own. Ms. Joubert agreed to review the details of the draft document with the Fire Chief, Police Chief, and Building Inspector to ensure that they are comfortable with the document being proposed at Town Meeting.

Ms. Adams requested additional feedback from the board and noted that she is still not confident that she has the direction needed to complete the document. Members of the board reiterated that they need to get a better visual to determine how they would want to define the limits for small scale and large scale solar facilities. Ms. Joubert agreed to research and provide information about nearby systems for the board's consideration, following which the board will discuss and provide input to Ms. Adams.

Ms. Poretsky voiced her opinion that the hazardous waste bylaw is insufficient. Ms. Joubert recalled previous discussions about requiring a 1000-foot setback from any wells. Ms. Adams noted that the language will stipulate a 1000-foot property line setback when abutting a residential district. Ms. Poretsky indicated that she would like to look more closely at solid waste disposal facilities and asked if it is possible to prohibit them in town. Ms. Adams voiced her understanding that they cannot be entirely prohibited. She noted that the site assignment is regulated by the state so it is out of the hands of the local permitting authorities. Ms. Gillespie asked if it is possible to allow the use in the Highway Business district, where it is unlikely to happen. Ms. Joubert stated that it cannot be put in a district where there is no available space for it. She also recalled previous discussions about allowing the use in Business South and Highway Business and by special permit in the Industrial district.

In response to questions from board members about increasing the property line setback to 1500 feet, Ms. Adams stated that it would be an undue regulation to have massive setbacks. Ms. Joubert agreed to check with the Town's GIS Director about getting a map of available lots and setback impacts done in time for the board's January meeting. Ms. Gillespie emphasized the need to rezone the Southwest Cutoff area as previously discussed, as she would not like to

see any of that land become a solid waste facility. Ms. Joubert agreed that it should be commercially zoned, but voiced uncertainty about the best approach to do so. In response to a question from Ms. Martinek about any properties that might be at risk, Ms. Joubert stated that she does not believe there are any at this time.

Consideration of Minutes

Minutes of the Meeting of October 1, 2019 - Ms. Joubert explained that the ZBA had approved the Minutes of the Joint Meeting held on October 1, 2019.

Michelle Gillespie made a motion to approve the Minutes of the Planning Board Meeting and the Joint Meeting with the ZBA held on October 1, 2019. Millie Milton seconded; motion carries by unanimous vote.

Minutes of the Meeting of October 17, 2019 - Ms. Joubert reviewed requested edits to the draft minutes.

Michelle Gillespie made a motion to approve the Minutes of the Meeting of October 17, 2019 as amended. Millie Milton seconded; motion carries by unanimous vote.

Master Plan Steering Committee Update - December 10th presentation by Master Plan Steering Committee and Planning Board public hearing

Ms. Martinek noted that the presentation and public hearing will be held on December 10, 2019 at the 7PM at the library. Members of the board discussed and agreed on the format for the presentation and hearing.

Ms. Milton asked if board members can be provided with a copy of the Master Plan for review. Ms. Joubert agreed to do so.

Ms. Poretsky discussed the possibility that she may not be able to attend the Planning Board meeting of January 7, 2020. Ms. Joubert explained that there is a special permit hearing scheduled, and emphasized the need to have at least 4 members present.

ANRs, Lot Releases, Bonds – Ms. Joubert indicated that there are none for consideration.

Subcommittee Updates

Design Review Committee (DRC) – Ms. Gillespie indicated that the DRC will be meeting tomorrow morning.

Community Preservation Committee (CPC) – Ms. Milton noted that there is an upcoming meeting on Thursday.

Groundwater Advisory Committee (GAC) – Ms. Poretsky noted that the GAC will be meeting tomorrow.

Central Massachusetts Regional Planning Committee (CMRPC) – Ms. Martinek indicated that there is no update to provide.

Preparation for 2020 Annual Town Meeting – Given the late hour, board members agreed to defer the discussion to their next meeting.

Town Planner Update – Ms. Joubert stated that she has nothing further to discuss.

Next Planning Board Meetings - December 12th, January 7th & 21st

Next ZBA Meeting - January 28th

Meeting adjourned at 9:55PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Elaine Rowe
Board Secretary