



# TOWN OF NORTHBOROUGH PLANNING BOARD

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

---

Approved 08.04.20

**Planning Board  
Zoom Meeting Minutes  
June 16, 2020**

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

**Members Absent:** None

**Others (Remotely):** Kathy Joubert, Town Planner; Fred Litchfield, Town Engineer; Robert Frederico, Building Inspector; David Doneski (K.P. Law); Brian Mazar; Mike Sullivan, Connorstone Engineering, Stephen Madaus (Mirick O'Connell)

Chair Martinek called the Zoom meeting to order at 6:30 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 and the process was explained.

Member and Staff roll call was taken: Anthony Ziton, Michelle Gillespie, Mille Milton, Amy Poretsky, Kathy Joubert, Fred Litchfield, and Robert Frederico.

Continued Discussion RE: Site Plan Approval for 400 Cedar Hill Street:

**Applicant:** New England F.C.  
**Engineer:** Field Engineering Co., Inc.  
**Date Filed:** January 22, 2020  
**Decision Due:** April 21, 2020 (date suspended due to enactment of Chapter 53 of the Acts of 2020 (Act))

The site plan was reviewed at the June 9, 2020 Planning Board meeting; outstanding issue was Town Counsel's review of the Dover Amendment as it applies to this application. The applicant identified the educational use element, a non-profit educational corporation and in their opinion, they meet that level. The educational activity is to be used for a primary or dominant purpose to make it applicable for the Dover Amendment. Attorney Doneski cited two cases: Metrowest YMCA which was deemed not predominantly used for educational purposes, and Timothy Hill Children's Ranch which the courts determined would be used for religious and educational purposes and the Dover Amendment applied. Attorney Doneski said it was appropriate for the board to ask about the particular activities of how the program at the New England Futbol Club facility would be presented in order to be satisfied that there is an educational purpose which is the goal of the activity as proposed.

Ms. Milton felt the educational use was pretty loose and wanted to see what the component was under instruction and education since it looks like a fitness or sports center. Mr. Mazar explained the sample

calendar and said they provide youth soccer programs for ages 7-23 with two main goals: (1) to develop children so they can play at a higher level (college), and (2) work with underserved communities to provide the opportunity to train players for the college level with scholarships. It is a combination of classroom training and on-field training. They are not renting the facility to other clubs/organizations. The training and classroom schedules were explained. Showcases are run where preparatory schools and college coaches attend. It is a multi-purpose facility; the children spend significant amount of time with licensed staff.

Ms. Poretsky asked Attorney Doneski if he felt the information was enough to qualify under the Dover Amendment. Attorney Doneski said the level of explanation Mr. Mazar discussed was not anywhere in writing and, in order for the board to have a level of comfort, it would be appropriate to have a written curriculum or materials that explain what is on the schedule, e.g., does the program as described exist in written form and what materials are there that describe the particular experiences that are offered to the participants. Mr. Mazar said for every program run there is a curriculum; he can provide samplings. The P&S was signed over six months ago; their due diligence process runs out at the end of June at which time the seller can walk away. Ms. Gillespie asked Attorney Doneski if it was approved under the Dover Amendment and the property is sold, does it transfer with the property. Attorney Doneski said the protection is not personal to an owner, it is based on the use and whether a particular owner qualifies under the statute (non-profit educational corporation). The Planning Board has an Article on the Town Warrant proposing to allow recreational facilities as an allowed use in that district; if the applicant could wait until July, it would be an allowed use. Attorney Doneski said if the use were allowed, it would be allowed regardless of the status of entity. Ms. Gillespie said the applicant could request a 60-90-day extension and have it go to town meeting. Ms. Poretsky said the Dover Amendment can go in any district and this would set a precedent. Mr. Ziton felt it was a good use and has good programs, but not sure if the Dover Amendment sets a precedence. Attorney Doneski said if there was another proposed use the same type as this one, then that would be the basis for the next proponent. Ms. Milton has the concern about setting a precedent because it is so loosely worded; she understands there is a time constraint but does not want to decide without doing due diligence and would like to see more specific instructional details. She asked what was the reason for applying under the Dover Amendment, and could they remove it from the Site Plan application or does it have to be part of it. Mr. Mazar said they applied because it was a valid use; it was meant to move the process along; the seller is anxious; they have already gotten two extensions; their counsel suggested presenting it this way; the Building Inspector approved it and it was not an issue until now. Ms. Milton thought the building inspector determination sheet was for informational use, not for decisions. Ms. Joubert pointed out that given the status of the environment, the outcome of town meeting is unpredictable. If the use was approved, the applicant would have to refile a new application for Site Plan Review; the Site Plan Review along with the use falling under the Dover Amendment is the application before them at the present time and has been before the Design Review Committee. Mr. Frederico said at the time of the application the board was working on the Zoning Amendment to make indoor commercial recreation an allowed use. The applicant was made aware of that; there were no guarantees of the outcome. They felt more secure going through the Dover Amendment. Mr. Frederico made the interpretation that they were correct. He was confused why the board was so worried about a Dover Amendment use when they were writing the proposal to make it an allowed use by right. Ms. Milton felt it was being used as a “work around”. Mr. Frederico said that is what it is. It is a work around so they can put a religious or educational use anywhere they want and it is federally protected. Although Ms. Poretsky likes soccer and it is a good use in the location, she is concerned about setting a precedent by using the Dover Amendment because it could go in any location; including residential.

Mr. Mazar was very concerned, anxious and very disappointed. He was unaware the board was taking this path and wished Town Counsel had a conversation with his attorney since his attorney feels very strongly that it falls under the Dover Agreement. Ms. Martinek asked Town Counsel if the information provided tonight is enough to make an informed decision. Attorney Doneski said while there is no reason to believe the documentation described doesn't exist, it's not in the record right now, as a matter of law they could make a decision tonight if they are satisfied with what was described tonight and it be put in the record. There should be documentation of those particular elements of this use that are sufficient to qualify for the Dover Amendment if that is the decision the board makes. Ms. Joubert said the applicant and his attorney were made aware that the ZBA has issued use variances in the past for this type of use; the applicant did not want to do this via the variance process; and the Dover Amendment exists for this type of use/process.

After a discussion of options, Mr. Mazar wanted to continue with the Dover Amendment and suggested Town Counsel contact his attorney. Prior to continuing the meeting, Ms. Poretsky made a motion to grant a waiver to Section 7.2.C9 of the Planning Board Rules & Regulations regarding the nature, location and size of all significant existing natural land features, including but not limited to trees, shrubs, brush, masses, specimen trees and all other trees over 10" in diameter; Ms. Gillespie seconded; roll call vote: Gillespie aye; Poretsky aye; Milton aye; Ziton aye; Martinek aye; motion approved. Ms. Milton made a motion to continue the public meeting for 400 Cedar Hill Street to July 21, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.; Mr. Ziton seconded; roll call vote: Gillespie aye; Poretsky aye; Milton aye; Ziton aye; Martinek aye; motion approved. Documentation to be provided include seminars, curriculum, any information showing the primary use of educational.

Discussion with Town Counsel RE: Newton Street, and consideration of Scenic Road permit requirements for 280 Newton Street:

Attorney Doneski provided a summary. On June 16, 2016, a Scenic Road Permit was issued for the rebuilding of approximately 80-feet of stone wall for construction on the 280 Newton Street property in connection with the development of 4 single-family dwelling driveways. The permit holder is 7<sup>th</sup> Group, LLC. Conditions include the completion of improvements as shown on a plan from 2014 created in connection with an ANR application for property on the other side of Newton Street. At the time of the current approval, there was a discussion between the applicant and representative of Noor Construction (owner of land on the other side of the street) regarding cost sharing for the roadway improvements. There was an agreement, conditions imposed, and upon completion of the work, an as-built plan was to be submitted to the Town Engineer. Paving was done last summer; the guardrail still needs to be constructed. The applicant's counsel is aware that there is a requirement for an easement on any areas of roadway improvement that might encroach on the property (Attorney Doneski did not see a reference to the easement in the permit decision). The owner of 280 Newton Street is suggesting he will not or cannot provide a guardrail but would be willing to grant an easement for access in the event of an encroachment. It appears the two developers had an understanding and are now at an impasse. 7<sup>th</sup> Group is asking if the town would be satisfied with providing an easement and not a guardrail.

Mr. Litchfield said the easement is along Mr. Ramadan's side of the property for roadway widening in the future. There was no requirement for an easement on the developer's side of the road. There is a requirement of 462 linear feet of guardrail on both sides of the street. The conditions that are included in the permit decision are relative to a Certificate of Occupancy. 7<sup>th</sup> Group's counsel seems to be asserting that the owner is unable to get permits to do work. The wording of the condition refers an Occupancy Permit, not a Building Permit.

Mr. Litchfield weighed in on Building Permit vs. Occupancy Permit. The town was put in a precarious position with Mr. Ramadan before the plans were completed. He had a house that was not to be occupied until plans were complete. A resident moved in and persuaded the school system to let their child attend school in town saying the Occupancy Permit was in the works. The town was being harassed for months by the individual looking for an Occupancy Permit which was not issued in accordance with the original permit that Mr. Ramadan had from a previous permit. Although the permit says Occupancy Permit, Mr. Litchfield would recommend to the board to not allow Building Permits until there is an agreement that the work is going to happen.

Attorney Doneski was looking for the status as well as the communication he had with 7<sup>th</sup> Group's counsel; they are contesting the terms of the permit. He also noted in his summary that Counsel is asserting that owner's development activities do not implicate the Scenic Road Bylaw (based on driveway openings in wall being less than 15 feet wide), but states that owner would be willing to grant easements to the town for maintenance of pavement or other roadway improvements that may encroach on owner's property. In his opinion, the bylaw was identified, an application made and decision rendered. He doesn't know if the property owner is going to pursue the matter. The question is are there any elements that the physical improvements that are part of the permit conditions that the board would be willing to modify or relax.

Ms. Joubert said she has spoken several times with the applicant's attorney and Mr. Litchfield has spoken several times with Mr. Wombalt's (7<sup>th</sup> Group) engineer (Peter Bemis). Each conversation has centered around the applicant does not believe he is responsible for the items in his scenic road decision and each time it is explained to them that they chose not to appeal the decision so the conditions stand as written. Mr. Ziad Ramadan, the other developer, has acted in good faith, has done all the work that was required of him for him to move forward with his lots; he did carry out everything that was in his Scenic Road Decision. This particular applicant has not. Both Ms. Joubert and Mr. Litchfield recommended that the board maintain their decision. Ms. Gillespie agreed the board should hold the original Decision.

It was the consensus of the board that they have no desire for Attorney Doneski to make any modifications to the permit conditions at this point; it is up to the permit holder to decide to make a formal application for modifications or decide how else they wish to proceed. Attorney Doneski will communicate that there was no inclination to change what was described.

Continued Public Hearing to consider Proposed Zoning Amendments for 2020 Annual Town Meeting:

Ms. Joubert gave a PowerPoint presentation. The following Articles were reviewed; discussed; and minor revisions made.

**ARTICLE 38:** Section 7-05-030 Table of Uses, Table 1, Part A, Residential Districts, funeral home

**ARTICLE 39:** Section 7-05-020 Classification of uses, G. Business uses, kennel; Section 7-05-030 Table of Uses, Table 1, Part A and Part B, kennel

**ARTICLE 40:** Section 7-05-030 Table of Uses, Table 1, Part B, Commercial and Industrial Districts, indoor commercial recreation

**ARTICLE 41:** Section 7-05-020 Classification of uses, I. Industrial uses, (1) Light manufacturing; Section 7-05-030 Table of Uses, Table 1, Part B, Commercial and Industrial Districts, light manufacturing, warehouse, trucking, contractor's yard

**ARTICLE 42:** Section 7-05-020 Classification of uses, C. Residential uses; accessory, (6) Home occupation

**ARTICLE 43:** Section 7-06-030 (J) Supplemental density and dimensional regulations, duplexes

**ARTICLE 44:** Section 7-05-020 Classification of uses, add small-scale ground-mounted solar photovoltaic installation, solar photovoltaic installation roof-mounted, large-scale ground-mounted solar photovoltaic installation, solar photovoltaic installation canopy mounted; Section 7-05-030 Table of Uses, Table 1, Part A and Part B; Section 7-03-050 Site plans, A. Applicability; Section 7-06-020 Table of Density and Dimensional Regulations, Table 2. Table of Density and Dimensional Regulations, add new footnote; Section 7-06-030 Supplemental regulations, C. Yard requirements; Section 7-10-060 Large-Scale Ground-Mounted Photovoltaic Installation

**ARTICLE 45:** Section 7-02-040 Definitions, add Hazardous Materials; Section 7-05-020 Classification of uses, add Hazardous Waste Facility and Solid Waste Disposal Facility; Section 7-05-030 Table of Uses, Table 1, Part B, Commercial and Industrial Districts; Section 7-05-040 Environmental performance standards, F. Miscellaneous standards; Section 7-06-030 Supplemental regulations C. Yard requirements; Section 7-06-020 Table of Density and Dimensional Regulations, Table 2. Table of Density and Dimensional Regulations, add new footnote

Ms. Joubert noted that a letter was received by a resident, Scott Rogers.

Ms. Martinek asked for public comment. Scott Rogers (26 Tomahawk Drive) thanked the board for their hard work on the bylaws and mentioned he had a few more questions. Mr. Rogers asked if #7, from his letter, in Article 42 was a complete exclusion of vans and trucks on-site. He mentioned some contractors, such as painters, meet on-site in the morning to discuss the plans for the day and he wanted to know if this would now be a violation; he wasn't clear on timing. Mr. Frederico explained that parking would generally be overnight or during the day for an extended period of time; that's one of the reasons they went with two vehicles. Registered vehicles are any vehicle with a plate, and parking does have to be on a paved surface; there is discretion in terms of enforcement. Mr. Rogers asked if the removal of the footnote in Article 43 removed the board's flexibility on granting a waiver. Ms. Martinek explained that sometimes a waiver can be a disconnect; it should be up to the residents if they want to allow a reduction.

Henry Squillante (Crescent Drive) mentioned that the reason this waiver was here in the first place as it was added by developers. The residents had voted at town meeting to increase the lot size of a two-family from 100 to 150 feet and this waiver negated the vote of the residents.

Carter Brannon (22 Cherlyn Drive) commented that it seems like there were a lot of changes to Article 41. Can the town approve only part of it? Ms. Joubert explained that in this particular Article, the reason they were put together was because they do act as one. The definition in particular that is being changed, light manufacturing, does go hand in hand with light manufacturing use. They could be separated, but it would have to be done on the floor at Town Meeting.

With no further comments,

Ms. Poretsky recommended Article 38 to the Annual Town Meeting 2020 Warrant as written in the handout dated June 9, 2020; Ms. Gillespie seconded; roll call vote: Milton aye; Gillespie aye; Ziton aye; Poretsky aye; Martinek aye; motion approved.

Ms. Poretsky recommended Article 39 to the Annual Town Meeting 2020 Warrant as written in the handout dated June 9, 2020; Ms. Milton seconded; roll call vote: Milton aye; Gillespie aye; Ziton aye; Poretsky aye; Martinek aye; motion approved.

Ms. Poretsky recommended Article 40 to the Annual Town Meeting 2020 Warrant as written in the handout dated June 9, 2020; Ms. Milton seconded; roll call vote: Milton aye; Gillespie aye; Ziton aye; Poretsky aye; Martinek aye; motion approved.

Ms. Poretsky recommended Article 41 to the Annual Town Meeting 2020 Warrant as written in the handout dated June 9, 2020; Mr. Ziton seconded; roll call vote: Milton aye; Gillespie aye; Ziton aye; Poretsky aye; Martinek aye; motion approved.

Ms. Milton recommended Article 42 to the Annual Town Meeting 2020 Warrant as written in the handout dated June 9, 2020; Ms. Poretsky seconded; roll call vote: Milton aye; Gillespie aye; Ziton aye; Poretsky aye; Martinek aye; motion approved.

Ms. Poretsky recommended Article 43 to the Annual Town Meeting 2020 Warrant as written in the handout dated June 9, 2020; Ms. Gillespie seconded; roll call vote: Milton aye; Gillespie aye; Ziton aye; Poretsky aye; Martinek aye; motion approved.

Ms. Poretsky recommended Article 44 to the Annual Town Meeting 2020 Warrant as written in the handout dated June 9, 2020; Ms. Gillespie seconded; roll call vote: Milton aye; Gillespie aye; Ziton aye; Poretsky aye; Martinek aye; motion approved.

Ms. Poretsky recommended Article 45 to the Annual Town Meeting 2020 Warrant as written in the handout dated June 9, 2020; Mr. Ziton seconded; roll call vote: Milton aye; Gillespie aye; Ziton aye; Poretsky aye; Martinek aye; motion approved.

The Town Meeting will be held outside. Presentation and motions will be as follows: Ms. Milton Articles 38 & 39; Mr. Martinek Articles 40 & 41; Ms. Poretsky Article 42; Mr. Ziton Article 43; and Ms. Gillespie Articles 44 & 45.

Ms. Gillespie made a motion to close the public hearing; Ms. Milton seconded; roll call vote: Milton aye; Gillespie aye; Ziton aye; Poretsky aye; Martinek aye; motion approved.

Public Hearing for 222 West Main Street Common Driveway Special Permit Application:

Applicant Abu Construction, Inc.  
Engineer: Connorstone Engineering, Inc.  
Date Filed: January 22, 2020  
Decision Due: 90 days from close of hearing

Ms. Martinek read the hearing notice into record. Mike Sullivan (Connorstone Engineering) participated. It is part of a five-lot project. The two lots for tonight's discussion are on Route 20; 37,000 and 38,000 square foot lots. They are before the board for a Special Permit for the common driveway. Under Section 10.36 130, seven standards need to be evaluated prior to approval. Minimum width: 20-feet of pavement is proposed per the Fire Chief's request with an easement of 32-feet wide. Maximum grade: 6% for the first 50-feet and transitioning to an 8% slope is proposed; the distance from the closest right-of-way is 350-feet away (Crestwood Drive);

center line radius is 60-feet; minimum site distance: 1,000-feet looking to the west and 450-feet looking to the east; the easement for the driveway is 15-feet off the property line; house numbers have to be located in a certain area. Drainage pre- and post was evaluated. A series of Cultecs were used so there is no discharge onto Route 20; it accommodates the 100-year storm. Sewer and water line will run through an easement in the back of the house and connect on Lincoln Street. The curb cut has been approved by the state. The Fire Chief wanted a 20-foot wide driveway; plans were revised and were approved by the Fire Chief.

Regarding Mr. Litchfield's June 15, 2020 comment letter, #1-the plan will be resubmitted. #2-the drainage sheet will be revised. #5-drywells will be connected from the individual houses; the hood and catch basin will be revised. No issues with the remaining conditions. Mr. Litchfield said the plans say the site distance is 450-feet going towards the center of town and some grading in front of Lot 1a; he said the 450-feet needs to be confirmed on the as-built plan.

Ms. Poretsky asked if it had been before the Groundwater Committee. Mr. Litchfield responded no it hasn't as it is allowed by right provided it doesn't exceed the 15% impervious cover. She had a question concerning #10 in his review letter and the submission of a final plan. Mr. Litchfield explained the ANR plan creates only the lots. With a common driveway Special Permit, it shows on the ANR lots where the actual easement is and how it is defined; the plan (81X) is recorded at the Registry. It does not have to go to the Planning Board if no new lots are created. There will also be a Declaration of Covenants for the homeowners which he will review for clarity.

Mr. Ziton said given there is still pending litigation with the site, he is concerned about granting any permits at this time; will there be any impact? Ms. Joubert said this is strictly a common driveway being shown to two single family homes; if ultimately the appeal prevails and two duplexes are created instead of two single family homes, the location and purpose of the common driveway won't change. She also reiterated the Board had asked town counsel this question in the past regarding does pending litigation on a property stop the board from issuing other permits for the same parcel and town counsel responded the board doesn't stop reviewing and issuing other permits for the property. The Board also asked the question regarding pending litigation at 425 Whitney Street and town counsel responded the board continues with the site plan approval. Ms. Martinek said she remains hesitant to ask questions without advice from Town Counsel due to the pending litigation. Mr. Sullivan said if the board does not want a common driveway, they will go with two driveways by right and deal with MassDOT. Mr. Litchfield confirmed that MassDOT is in favor of one curb cut.

Ms. Martinek asked if there was public comment; there was none.

Mr. Sullivan said what is before the board is two single family houses with a common driveway; they have satisfied the requirements for the common driveway; the litigation is a separate issue. Ms. Gillespie said it would change because of the additional bump-out the Fire Chief wants. Ms. Joubert said the board could condition the Special Permit to be a common driveway for two single family houses as referenced on the plan. Mr. Litchfield said there would have to be access before the Fire Department would sign off and a Building Permit issued. Board members questioned why they haven't met with town counsel regarding pending litigation at 222 West Main Street and Ms. Joubert reiterated they have not met with Town Counsel because at this point in time, there isn't anything to discuss; the courts are currently closed and there hasn't been any action since the appeal has been filed. The board preferred to continue the hearing and enter executive session prior to the start of the continued hearing. Ms. Milton made a motion to continue the

public hearing for 222 West Main Street to July 21, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.; Mr. Ziton seconded; roll call vote: Milton aye; Gillespie aye; Ziton aye; Poretsky aye; Martinek aye; motion approved. Ms. Joubert will contact the Town Administrator and Town Counsel; executive session with town counsel to discuss 222 West Main Street will begin at 5:30 p.m.

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 read the hearing notice into record. Attorney Stephen Madaus (Mirick O’Connell) participated. At the March 10, 2020 meeting a second response memo to a series of questions the board wanted was submitted; there was a first set of questions in January (responded to in March which included the Transportation Impact Assessment from the Engineer, copy of the Order of Conditions issued by the Conservation Commission, Stormwater Management Report prepared by VHB, and Photometric Plan. He noted that the Groundwater Advisory Committee issued a letter dated March 10, 2020 recommending approval with conditions of the Stormwater Management Special Permit Report.

The most recent memo was in response the board’s questions, primarily about what technology was being used inside the building. The May 27, 2020 response letter was in response to the March 11, 2020 memo from the Planning Board. Attorney Madaus shared that Steris has been extremely busy during the pandemic as they are the one of two facilities in the United States sterilizing the nasal swabs used to test for covid-19, and they are also preparing to sterilize syringes and equipment for the pharmaceutical industry as they do testing and development for a potential vaccine. His memo also mentioned that there is a state law that governs the technology used by Steris and the state preempts local authority in this matter. He said they have been transparent throughout the entire process. Ms. Martinek said this was the final piece before moving onto the next phase of issuing the RFQ. Ms. Joubert said based on the last meeting in March, it was to get the responses to board’s questions, the request for qualifications has been reviewed, the DPW Director spoke with the Board about the process, and the language for the RFQ was agreed upon. The memo will be added this to the RFQ and it will be issued. It will be placed on the website, published in the State Monitor, a time set for public response, and a time set to interview candidates.

Staff had no comments; there was no public comment.

Mr. Ziton made a motion to move forward with the RFQ and incorporate the Memorandum with the previous materials and move forward with the RFQ process for 425 Whitney Street; Ms. Milton seconded; roll call vote: Milton aye; Gillespie aye; Ziton aye; Poretsky aye; Martinek aye; motion approved.

Ms. Joubert previously provided information to the board from Town Counsel asking if they could move forward with pending litigation; the response from Town Counsel was yes. Some members wanted additional details. She suggested since there will be an executive session on July 21<sup>st</sup>;

Town Counsel could be asked for the additional details or verification on what he provided her in February regarding 425 Whitney Street litigation.

Mr. Ziton made a motion to continue the public hearing for 425 Whitney Street to August 4, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.; Ms. Milton seconded; roll call vote: Milton aye; Gillespie aye; Ziton aye; Poretsky aye; Martinek aye; motion approved.

**Old/New Business:**

Consideration of June 9, 2020 Minutes – Tabled to July 7<sup>th</sup>.

No hearings are scheduled for July 7<sup>th</sup> and Ms. Gillespie will be unavailable for the meeting. Ms. Martinek would like to reserve the July 7<sup>th</sup> date for a possible meeting.

Mr. Ziton 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 9:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Melanie Rich  
Board Secretary