

**RECEIVED**

By Karen Wilber at 8:30 am, May 28, 2021

# TOWN OF NORTHBOROUGH PLANNING BOARD

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

---

Approved 04.20.2021

**Planning Board  
Zoom Meeting Minutes  
February 16, 2021**

**Members (Remotely):** Kerri Martinek, Chair; Amy Poretsky, Vice Chair; Anthony Ziton; Mille Milton; Michelle Gillespie

**Members Absent:** None

**Others (Remotely):** Kathy Joubert (Town Planner); Robert Frederico (Building Inspector); Fred Litchfield (Town Engineer)

**ZBA Attendees:** Fran Bakstran, Paul Tagliaferri, Dick Rand, Mark Rutan, Brad Blanchette

Chair Martinek called the Zoom meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and made the announcement that pursuant to Governor Baker's March 12, 2020 Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 20A, S18, and the Governor's March 15, 2020 Order imposing strict limitations on the number of people that may gather in one place, that the meeting of the Northborough Planning Board is being conducted via remote participation to the greatest extent possible. Public comment will be taken. The process was explained.

Member and Staff roll call was taken: Anthony Ziton, Mille Milton, Amy Poretsky, Michelle Gillespie, Kerri Martinek, Kathy Joubert (Town Planner); Robert Frederico (Building Inspector); Fred Litchfield (Town Engineer).

Transportation Discussion with Sujatha Krishnan, Program Manager, Central Massachusetts Regional Planning Commission (CMRPC) – Sujatha Krishnan (Deputy Director/Transportation), Trish Settles (Deputy Director), Janet Pierce (Executive Director), and Eric Gemperline (Transportation Planner) were in attendance. Ms. Krishnan gave a presentation on balancing traffic impact and economic development, mitigating the impacts of truck traffic on residential areas, and general recommendations on town level and corridor traffic management strategies. Mr. Gemperline shared his observations on the various streets as well as the traffic counts. Ms. Krishnan discussed possible corridor level solutions. Ms. Gillespie commented that the I-290 corridor has an impact on Northborough and should be focused on over time; she also thought the redevelopment Lyman Street was also good. Ms. Milton asked if there was criteria when a traffic study might be triggered by a Planning Board. Ms. Pierce said they could conduct a study and share the response. Ms. Martinek commented that the corridors start to feed into to other towns. What is the best way to bring in regional constituents? Ms. Settles has recently facilitated a meeting with three planning boards that share a site. Recommendations to safely co-exist include bike paths, better pedestrian access and safety. Ms. Martinek asked if there were any towns that successfully mitigated traffic and safety. Ms. Krishnan did not know about success, but said you make it less appealing by narrowing the roads for example. Ms. Settles commented that malls are becoming large warehouses. She said it may be a good idea for their team to look at where there are good examples to research. Ms. Martinek asked if there were

things that could be done before the final build-out or fix the area in general. Ms. Krishnan mentioned a post occupancy monitoring study.

A resident question asked what kind of transportation fees could be assessed. Ms. Krishnan said that would be more at the state level. Some communities have a Roadway Advisory Committee that look into not only using their Chapter 90 funds for repaving, but have asked the town to allocate more funding in the budget preparation based on the conditions of the roadways and how much more money would be needed on a yearly basis to maintain them. Residents have asked about a Traffic Safety Committee and have they been effective in other communities. Ms. Krishnan said there are regions with a Roadway Advisory Committee and said transportation can mean different things in different communities. The town has a good platform with the Master Plan Implementation Committee.

Ms. Martinek how do flex drivers differ from employee drivers. Ms. Krishnan said employee drivers can be better informed by their employer. Ms. Martinek asked how they normalize traffic data for seasonal differences. Ms. Krishnan said MassDOT has a formula, but there may be national statistics. Ms. Martinek asked if there is a way to work together if a truck exclusion is warranted based on data for one town, but permission is needed from another town. Ms. Krishnan said a truck exclusion cannot be done by a town unless MassDOT is involved. Are there towns that have employed a safety zone to keep speed limits down. Ms. Krishnan said towns cannot change it; MassDOT would have to be involved. Additional questions mentioned drones and robotic deliveries and what impact they would have; enforcement; financial contributions for infrastructure improvement; maintenance for small town roads. Ms. Poretsky asked if a cost of community service study had been done and was told no. It was suggested to have all the stakeholders meet. The CMRPC group was thanked for their presentation.

Continued Public Hearing Special Permit Common Driveway Application for 85 and 95 West Street, Map 57 Parcels 34 and 35, to construct a common driveway serving five lots:

Applicant: Brant Viner and Margaret Harling  
Engineer: WDA Design Group  
Date Filed: December 23, 2020  
Decision Due: 90 days from close of hearing

Ms. Gillespie recused herself from the matter. The applicant requested a continuance to the March 2<sup>nd</sup>. Ms. Milton made a motion to continue the Public Hearing Special Permit Common Driveway Application for 85 and 95 West Street, Map 57 Parcels 34 and 35, to construct a common driveway serving five lots to March 2, 2021 at 6:30 p.m.; Ms. Poretsky seconded; roll call vote: Milton-aye; Ziton-aye; Poretsky-aye; Martinek-aye; motion approved.

Ms. Gillespie rejoined the board at 7:14 p.m.

**Old/New Business:**

Because of an email from a resident the board received regarding 330 & 350 Bartlett Street, at a future meeting Ms. Martinek would like to review the Decision and discuss what's going on with some of the temporary structures at Amazon, the noise study, and the lighting to see what our responsibility is because there is a lot of frustration about enforcement.

Ms. Martinek said the board has a certain number of Local Planning Assistance (LPA) hours. She wanted to allocate time for the ADA walking path grant. Ms. Joubert said the DPW is working with a consulting firm to see if there are other grants sources it would fit into. She will ask CMRPC how many hours would be needed for the neighborhood audit, post-occupancy grant and the ADA grant.

Ms. Martinek asked if the ZBA Mill Street application was it coming through Site Plan Review. Ms. Joubert said it was originally filed as an appeal of the Zoning Enforcement Officer's decision that the use is not allowed in that zoning district. The ZBA determined more information was needed, one of which was to submit a site plan, and go before the GWAC. Mr. Litchfield said a meeting is scheduled with the GWAC. He did not think she needed a site plan; she needs a special permit to conduct her business in the groundwater area and was seeking a variance.

Ms. Martinek asked Mr. Litchfield what the agenda item on the Groundwater Advisory Committee, informal discussion regarding Groundwater application Review and Recommendation Process Pursuant to Planning Board Member's Comments during Planning Board Meetings of January 19<sup>th</sup> and February 2<sup>nd</sup>, was about. Mr. Litchfield said there was some discussion about the process that the Committee goes through in order to make a recommendation and they wanted to talk more about it. Ms. Martinek was not sure who was representing the board and asked Ms. Poretsky if she was representing and discussing their comments; she said no and it was the first she's heard about it. Mr. Litchfield said the Chair asked him to put it on the agenda; he wanted to talk about it and make sure that the rest of the Committee was aware of the comments that were made at the board's previous meetings. Also on the agenda is an item to review the proposed zoning bylaw. Ms. Martinek said they've made no formal statement and again asked Ms. Poretsky if she was comfortable representing the board in whatever this discussion may be. If Ms. Poretsky can't make it, perhaps another member could make it since they don't know what it's about or the purpose to be properly represented.

On the March 2<sup>nd</sup> agenda, Ms. Martinek wanted to include an executive session regarding the litigation of the 0 Bartlett Decision which was appealed. Ms. Joubert explained that when litigation is involved, it is Town Counsel that reaches out to the board when they need to meet. Ms. Martinek wants to discuss some of her concerns, the next steps, the approach, and what they need to plan for. Ms. Poretsky made a motion to go into executive session at the March 2, 2021 meeting at 6:00 p.m. to discuss litigation; Mr. Ziton seconded; roll call vote: Milton-aye; Ziton-aye; Poretsky-aye; Martinek-aye; motion approved. Also to be included on the agenda is a review of the 330-350 Decision, and communication with Town Counsel.

Continued Public Hearing Definitive Subdivision Application for 0 Bartlett Street, Map 51 Parcel 3 and Map 66 Parcel 16, to construct a four-lot subdivision:

Applicant: The Gutierrez Company  
Engineer: Allen & Major Associates, Inc.  
Date Filed: December 17, 2020  
Decision Due: March 16, 2021

Attorney Mark Donahue, Matt Heil (Sanborn, Head & Associates), David Robinson, Rob Nagi, and Israel Lopez were in attendance. The applicant submitted revisions, additional comments and documents. David Robinson said they resubmitted revisions on February 5<sup>th</sup> and understood those plans were distributed to the appropriate department. They received an email from the DPW Director saying they took no exception, and Mr. Litchfield issued a letter today (February 16, 2021) restating the comments before that lots B1 and B2 are non-buildable. The applicant has not requested any waivers, they need to go before Conservation and Earthworks, a stop sign which was on the plan, and no right

turn for trucks only should be proposed at the intersection of Bartlett Street (which they have). Comment #6 mentioned that the applicant had indicated that traffic analysis as submitted represents the most conservative data available at this time; comment #7 sums it up that the DPW Director has indicated that the revised drawings and response memorandum adequately addressed all comments previously noted by the Public Works Department. They feel with their resubmitted plans that they have adequately addressed all the engineering and DPW comments at this time.

Ms. Poretsky said when they went through the Parcel H subdivision at the very end there was discussion about the driveway going east and asked if they discussed it with the Police or Fire Chief to see if that driveway would work. Mr. Robinson said they did receive a letter back from the Police Chief saying that he had no concerns, and received a letter from the Fire Chief saying that the redesigned driveway was sufficient for servicing the fire vehicle and had no concerns at this time; both have signed off on the revised driveway and were distributed earlier last week. She said she was talking about Parcel H, the original application at the very end of the hearing, there was discussion about a left turn only for trucks and a rumble strip; did it ever go back to the Fire Chief for approval for the driveway that pushed the truck traffic to the east. Attorney Donahue recalled that they discussed it with the board to see if it had an interest and believes more than one member of the board expressed concerns about it because of the ability to access into the site and really didn't do that. With the subdivision plan before the board currently, they looked at the rules and regulations governing subdivisions and the guides and the Town Engineer who wanted to have the intersection be as close to 90 degrees as possible, so that took it off the table for discussion as part of the subdivision.

Mr. Litchfield sent a memo today which the board has not yet read. Mr. Robinson had just read the memo he wrote, so the board heard his comments. The letter said the plans were reviewed and there is no outstanding engineering or DPW issues. With regard to the letter from the Police Chief, Mr. Nagi said it touched on a lot of the points that reflect concern about what goes into the development later on down the road, which again he reiterated to the board, will be the subject of a site plan approval. They are comfortable with the changes to the plan and the requests/recommendations in the letter from the Police Chief; no parking along the roadway driveway, no idling of commercial vehicles allowed on site (more of an operational issue if and when a project comes before the board). They are comfortable designating and angling the driveway to direct traffic to the east.

Ms. Martinek commented that they received a note from Kristin Black (Board of Health); she did not have comments, but there was discussion as to who was responsible for following up on the VOC levels. Attorney Donahue asked Matt Heil (Sanborn, Head & Associates) to better explain the source of concern over the VOCs and how it could potentially or possibly relate this development site.

Matt Heil is Vice President with Sanborn, Head & Associates; a registered Professional Engineer and Licensed Site Professional. His area of expertise is in brownfields redevelopment and has been practicing for nearly 26 years. Mr. Heil said it is very manageable from a contaminant perspective. Redevelopments that drain towards drinking water sources are done safely regularly under the guidance of LSP's. He showed the area that has been historically used for light industry (the southern end of Hayes Memorial Drive). There have been releases on those properties that have included chlorinated solvents called Chlorinated Volatile Organic Compounds which are solvents that work well for various things in industry cleaning and keeping things moving well. Releases or spills in Massachusetts are governed under Massachusetts Law Chapter 21E; there are enabling regulations which is the Massachusetts Contingency Plan that LSP's follow. He wanted to be clear that there are no releases on the Gutierrez property itself, but there are some offsite releases. All but one of those have been assessed, cleaned up, and closed out with permanent solution statements. The one that is still open is at

33 Hayes Memorial Drive which still in the MCP assessment process. The responsible party is RDC International (the Rhododyne Company used to be in the building); they are in phase two of the assessment process. With regard to groundwater water flow, on eastern side closest to that release the groundwater is going to flow to the northwest and then north. Groundwater in the development area on the western side, more than half a mile away, also flows to the north toward Stirrup Brook. Therefore, the two regimes are cross gradient to one another; they are not crossing or mixing they are running parallel for one another. He said that is important because of the distance and the cross gradient nature that separates these two regimes, in his experienced opinion, it is clear that the proposed development doesn't risk either exacerbating that existing release over at 33 Hayes Memorial Drive that is still in process of assessment, nor does it preclude the proposed or further response actions that they might may need to do as they move forward as the responsible party and the things they might decide to do based on their statutory obligation to do those things. He sees the two as very independent and not concerned.

Ms. Poretsky commented on the number of spills. Mr. Heil said the spills happened in the 1960s and 1970s. She wondered if there should be a condition added to Groundwater that testing should occur every so often if they are in the groundwater zone. He cautioned having blanket requirements like that that might otherwise miss important things. Ms. Milton asked if there was a time constraint for when cleanup has to occur. Mr. Heil said under the MCP, once it is known and gets reported, the PRP has to assess it and bring it to closure within six years.

Ms. Gillespie addressed Mr. Litchfield's letter and said the subdivision road is going to go straight out to Bartlett Street, it's not going to be positioned to go more to the right for traffic exiting to the right, it's going to intersect with Bartlett Street at a 90 degree angle. Installing a sign to indicate no right turns will not be sufficient to prevent right hand turns. She advocated with the last property the board was discussing to have some sort of physical barrier to get the traffic to go towards 495 vs. down Bartlett Street. She wondered if they should address that now; if there is some way that road could physically shift the traffic away from heading down towards Bartlett Street. Attorney Donahue does not think it is an easy fix, particularly this far along in the process. If the plan proceeds, more than just a subdivision, it will be a plan that will require site plan approval. They could possibly look more at it then. He did not think we would want to take a step back and look at that now as part of this approval process.

Ms. Martinek wanted to clarify that everything Mr. Heil noted are spills. Mr. Heil said they are not all releases. She said the sample report from December notes whatever is happening there constitutes an REC to the subject site and asked what it meant. Mr. Heil explained that the REC means that there is the potential for that release at 33 Hayes, even though it is not quite fully delineated yet, it could come on to the Gutierrez property because of groundwater flow directions. It does not mean they have to sample. She asked who has to monitor it. Mr. Heil said it is not the town's responsibility. It is the responsibility of the person who caused the release. Ms. Martinek said that they are finding evidence of CVOCs in addition to diesel from trucks. She asked about the risk level; he said it is site specific. The biggest risk for a site like this is vapor intrusion. It will mix with the water, so the responsible party will have to delineate the nature and extent of the release, which they are working on now. Asked if it was reviewed by staff, Ms. Joubert said in-house it is a combination of staff that reviews it; they go through the executive summary. If they have any questions they will correspond with the applicant. They receive many Phase 1 studies.

Ms. Martinek said the Conservation component is still outstanding. Attorney Donahue said as indicated in his letter provided to the board last week, the policy with the Wetlands Protection Regulations, unlike a Planning Board where an applicant has a choice to submit alternative designs, essentially there is only

one Order of Conditions outstanding to a site at any one time. There is an existing Order of Conditions as to the site plan that was before this board previously. They would either amend it or withdraw it at some point if they go forward with the subdivision, but they are not prepared to do that now until they decide what the best alternative for the development of the site is. The Order of Conditions related to approximately seven acres of impervious area on the site with work in close proximity to wetland resource areas proposed in this plan. They would be amenable to a condition of approval of the board that no work commence until an Order of Conditions has been provided to the board. She said the subdivision roadway requires Conservation approval. Attorney Donahue said it has been determined in Massachusetts that an applicant has a choice as to how to proceed with the various permits its needs. A Planning Board cannot deny an approval because some other board has not issued approval yet. The board can condition it, but they cannot deny it. She read 10-20-070 Conservation Commission Review. Attorney said they filed a Notice of Intent for work that exceeded the subdivision before the board. They received an Order of Conditions for what was going to be the driveway which is substantially in the same location as the subdivision roadway, plus the building, plus the parking areas, plus the detention and everything else. That Order is in existence. She asked how will it be documented. Attorney Donahue said it is documented by the fact that the Order of Conditions has been issued for significantly greater work on the site than is proposed by the subdivision plan. It is more likely than not the subdivision plan will be approved and it would be appropriate for the Planning Board to impose a condition of approval requiring that that Order be obtained specific to the subdivision roadway prior to construction commencing of the subdivision road. She thought at the last meeting they pursuing a meeting with Conservation to square it up and not sure why they can't meet the requirement. Attorney Donahue said they had a discussion to see if there could be some sort of advisory opinion in some fashion and found the only way to proceed with that was to withdraw or amend the existing Order. Given the fact that they are on appeal of this board's denial of that, they are not prepared to take that action.

Ms. Poretsky commented on the subdivision in general and said they are being told that this subdivision is only the driveway; it is four pieces of land with no buildings on it; the whole point of the subdivision is to put buildings on it and were told at the last meeting that they are going to build on H1 and B2; it is going to be more buildings, more impervious area and going to be more conservation to look at when the second building goes on. The way she reads the subdivision bylaws is those all have to be discussed now. She said they know there will be warehouse or industrial buildings on those and it's going to be more now than they are saying; there are four parcels vs. one parcel; there are two lots being subdivided; it isn't one parcel with a defined outside lot area that is becoming four lots. Lot H and Lot B are being subdivided. Lot B in her opinion isn't even valid for a subdivision because according to the rules and regulations, if a tract of land goes into two or more lots, it shall not be deemed to constitute a subdivision if the lots within the tract divided have frontage on the public way. When they split Lot B, they both have frontage. Attorney Donahue said it is not an easy area of the law to follow, but it is the tried-and-true law that when you begin with a subdivision, you begin with a premise that is in the state statute that you are entitled to an approval to divide your land in the manner you want if you meet the rules and regulations that exist within the community. The board has a letter from the Town Engineer that says this plan does meet those rules and regulations. It is the law in Massachusetts that this is how an owner proceeds to create additional lots out of its land. While it looks like two lots (and was discussed at the last meeting), they provided evidence of the perpetual easement right across the aqueduct that the Gutierrez Company has, and know they were seeking opinion of Town Counsel as to whether that constituted two different subdivisions or one subdivision. There will be plenty of opportunity to look at the real impacts. The impact here is approximately a one-half acre of impervious area. Ms. Poretsky said Lot B has a border around it and the rear of Lot B ends when you hit the aqueduct. You go over the aqueduct and then Lot H starts and that's where the frontage is. Are they saying it is not two parcels? Attorney Donahue said they recognize that it is two physical pieces of

property owned by one party who has a right to cross somebody else's property (the Commonwealth of Massachusetts) over the aqueduct. That constitutes one subdivision, as that term is used in the statute. She said the regs say physically contiguous and they are not physically contiguous. Attorney Donahue said they are separated but thinks it would be inappropriate to ignore the fact that they are joined by means of an access easement. For purposes of the subdivision, for the purposes of this meeting, they are treated as one property of one owner. She asked if there was an easement legally tied to the deed and said the 8M Permit is only for the access drive. Attorney Donahue said the correspondence he provided attached the original grant of easement to the then property owner now owned by Gutierrez. The ownership of that easement, the right to use that easement, has followed each and every subsequent owner since that time. Gutierrez now has good clear title to an easement to cross the aqueduct. She didn't see the ownership of the easement. Attorney Donahue explained that an easement, once granted, is a perpetual right; it is not affirmed each and every time; it is part and parcel of Gutierrez's acquisition of this property. The fact that it is old doesn't make it bad or defective in any way; being able to cross from Bartlett Street onto the rest of the property was established as a property right at that time. She said an easement would be needed to cross Lot B and was told the subdivision roadway is the means for crossing.

Ms. Martinek said there were some outstanding questions they need to confirm with Town Counsel. She also said we've been talking about the 8M permit and Attorney Donahue mentioned that they don't plan to pursue a new permit for that. Attorney Donahue said not exactly. He said what they indicated was that they are not going to pursue a new permit while they are in permitting process here on a plan that may or may not be approved by the board. What they will do and what they will need to do is seek a new or amended 8M permit by specific reference to the subdivision plan; they provided language for a proposed condition of approval that would make it clear that they have to provide that in the future. The 8M permit that the board has reflects the plan which is being referred to as the driveway which is what it was in the site plan. From a construction viewpoint, particularly as to its impact on a depth issue to the aqueduct, is essentially the same and are very confident that they will get that at some point should this board approve it. They won't ask the state agency for another permit without knowing that the plan they are submitting to them has been accepted by this board.

Ms. Martinek said she feels she has been asking for the updated permit since the preliminary, and in fact one of the reasons they denied it was because they didn't have that permit. To come back around and continue to say they don't want to get that permit, she thinks the message has been going out consistently that the board is looking for that permit, not as a condition beyond our approval, but prior to approval. She said it is pretty clear and has been said many times across many hearings, including the preliminary decision. She further said it was their prerogative if they don't want to pursue it, but with the understanding that the board is looking to see it and failure to provide the adequate permit is their choice. With regard to the impact statement said that sometimes it talks about the warehouse and other times about the road; there is inconsistency; is there a warehouse or not. All of the studies focus on the warehouse except the impact study that says there is only going to be a road. What is the actual impact when we are looking at different data for different scenarios? With regard to Conservation, she didn't know what the disconnect was with that; it is part of the rules and regulations and the board is looking for something from Conservation as part of their application.

Attorney Donahue said the letter he submitted serves the purpose for it all, and since they are indicating that they were going to be reviewing further with Town Counsel, urged the board strongly to ask Town Counsel as to the board's authority to require, prior to acting on the subdivision, some other board's action because there is specific case law on the issue. The rules and regulations the board drafts, unlike for example a zoning bylaw, are never reviewed by a third party. You can write anything you want in

your rules and regulations. What they are governed by is the state statute, Chapter 41 Section 81q, which defines the jurisdiction that a board can impose rules and regulations. A number of the board's rules and regulations, in his opinion, exceed their authority. The applicant tries to comply as best they can with them through the filings they've made and said they should review that carefully with Town Counsel. Ms. Martinek assumed that at some point Town Counsel reviewed the rules and regs; Attorney Donahue said that would be an unfair assumption. She said they are responsible for providing all permits related to the application and failure to provide the required permits is grounds for disapproving the application. The board needs the 8M permit and proof of easement. Questions for Town Counsel will include discussion on general subdivision rules and regulations and ownership.

Ms. Martinek asked for public comment. Michael Bernzweig (4 Jenkins Drive) wants the board to look into whether or not Attorney Donahue is violating the Conflict-of-Interest Law. As a former town committee member, he may be violation of the forever ban.

Kristin and John Wixted (2 Stirrup Brook Lane) asked why they are applying only for the subdivision and the road without providing the impact study for a building while at the same time appealing the decision about the building. Attorney Donahue said the subdivision plan provides an alternative means of development of land that Gutierrez has owned for an extended period of time. In light of the disapproval by the Planning Board, they had to look at all options; this becomes one of the options to look at. John Wixted sent an email to the board with his concerns. He said the traffic report was outdated and contained factual inaccuracies. Regarding the VOCs, he said the town is under no obligation to allow development on the property until the phase 2 study is complete and clarified.

Brian Gwyn (6 Jenkins Drive) asked what could be done to prevent future spills specific to this site and commented that it can take six years to clean it up. Mr. Litchfield said the spills that occurred were in Marlborough and not in Northborough. The rules have changed over the years as well as the methods of operation for businesses. There is a reporting requirement for any spill over 5 gallons to the DEP. There are requirements as part of a groundwater special permit that they can't store hazardous or toxic materials on site; in the event that they have applied for a special permit that requires they will, they have to present proper mitigation plans and containment plans. Mr. Gwyn said preventing any activity or the use of any chemicals in that area should be taken into account.

Rachel Armstrong (10 Hemlock Drive) was not sure why we were even considering more industrial development when it's been validated by the CMRPC that there are major traffic and safety issues with the current situation on Bartlett Street.

After further board discussion, questions to be discussed with legal counsel will relate to ownership, how it carries through the title, how do you know an easement is not terminated if you can't track it to the current title; questions about a subdivision with frontage; and do we have to approve a non-conforming lot.

Ms. Milton made a motion to continue the public hearing for the Definitive Subdivision Application for 0 Bartlett Street to March 2, 2021 at 6:30 p.m.; Ms. Poretsky seconded; roll call vote: Milton-aye; Gillespie-aye; Ziton-aye; Poretsky-aye; Martinek-aye; motion approved.

#### **Bylaw Discussion:**

Prohibited Uses – Members agreed to move forward with it.



Contractor's Yard – Members agreed to move forward with it.

Accessory Dwelling – Members agreed to move forward with it.

Commercial Storage Facility – Members agreed to move forward with it.

Groundwater Protection Overlay District (C. Establishment and Delineation) – Members agreed to move forward with it.

Groundwater Protection Overlay District (D. Use Regulations) – Members agreed to move forward with it.

Wholesale Trade – Mr. Litchfield recommended waiting to discuss it with Ms. Joubert.

Remaining articles to be finalized are Craft Breweries and Non-Conforming.

Ms. Poretsky made a motion to adjourn; Ms. Milton seconded; roll call vote: Milton-aye; Gillespie-aye; Ziton-aye; Poretsky-aye; Martinek-aye; motion approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Melanie Rich  
Board Secretary