Nantucket Planning Board

Nantucket Planning Board APPROVED Minutes
Remote Participation via Zoom Webinar
July 10, 2023 @ 4:00 PM

**The Planning Board meeting will be audio and video recorded*

Board Members: David Iverson (Chair), Joseph Topham (Vice-Chair), John Trudel, III, Nat Lowell, and Barry Rector

Alternates: Stephen Welch, Carl Borchert, Abby De Molina

Staff: Leslie Snell (Director of Planning), Meg Trudel (Land Use Planner) and Catherine Ancero (PLUS Administrative Specialist)

PLANNING BOARD DRAFT MINUTES
07-10-2023

Webinar Registration Link:
https://us06web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_jtQ5cvvoQF6B4RE1IULTKQ#/registration

To view the meeting only, see link below:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GdizfelF35A

I. Call to order:

Chair Iverson called the meeting to order at 4:04PM.

Chair Iverson read a prepared statement in accordance with Governor Baker's March 21, 2020, order regarding open meeting law, which outlines how the meeting is conducted via remote participation and states the ground rules for any discussion.

Roll call of those participating:

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Vice-Chair Topham *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*
Barry Rector *Aye*
Chair Iverson *Aye*

Alternates:
Carl Borchert *Aye*
Stephen Welch *Aye*
Abby De Molina *Aye*

Staff:
Megan Trudel Aye
Leslie Snell *Aye*
Catherine Ancero *Aye*

II. **Approval of the agenda:**
Mr. Rector moved to approve the agenda. The motion was duly seconded by Vice-Chair Topham, and the motion was carried unanimously.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Barry Rector *Aye*
Vice-Chair Topham *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*
Chair Iverson *Aye*

III. **Minutes:**

- **June 8, 2023,** ***CONTINUE***
- **June 12, 2023**

Motion/Vote: Mr. Rector moved to approve the June 12th minutes as submitted. The motion was duly seconded by Vice-Chair Topham, and the motion was carried unanimously 5-0.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Barry Rector *Aye*
Vice-Chair Topham *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Chair Iverson *Aye*

Motion/Vote: Mr. Rector moved to table the minutes of June 8th. The motion was duly seconded by Vice-Chair Topham, and the motion was carried unanimously 5-0.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Barry Rector *Aye*
Vice-Chair Topham *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Chair Iverson *Aye*

IV. **Secondary Dwellings:**

- **Richard A. & Shannon M. Boehm - 63 New Sias Street**
- **Tamara Wing - 52 West Chester Street**
- **Marcia J. Coyle - 61 Pochick Avenue**
- **Kara & John Rogers - 32 Lyons Lane**

Motion/Vote: Mr. Rector moved to approve all the second dwellings listed above in accordance with the recommendations outlined in the staff report. The motion was duly seconded by Mr. Lowell and the motion was carried unanimously 4-0.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Barry Rector *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*
Vice-Chair Topham *Aye*
Chair Iverson *Aye*

V. ANRs:

- **Town of Nantucket - Madequecham Valley Road, Weweeder Avenue**
- **Michael James Egan - 13 Pine Crest Drive**
- **Ann M. Egan - 11 Pine Crest Drive**
- **Marcia J. Coyle - 61 Pochick Avenue**
- **Hinckley Lane 2010 Nantucket Trust, Richard K. Lubin, Trustee - 6 Hinckley Lane**
- **Nantucket Islands Land Bank - 7 Nobadeer Farm Road**
- **Patrick L. Dober & Claire Danaher, TRS Angel's Roost NT - 8 Silver Street**
- **Forty-Four Hooper Farm Road Nominee Trust - 44 Hooper Farm Road**
- **Julie & Mathew Reinemo - 2 Eli Place**
- **Harold Brothers Realty, LLC - 2, 4 & 6 Highland Avenue**
- **156 Cliff Road Nominee Trust, Monica Halperin, Trustee and 158 Cliff Road Nominee Trust, Richard P. Beaudette, Trustee - 156 & 158 Cliff Road**
  SEE PUBLIC HEARING
- **Reel Keeper, LLC - 10 Surfside Drive**
  SEE PUBLIC HEARING
- **Joseph J. & Marcia J. Aguiar - 68 Fairgrounds Road**
  SEE PUBLIC HEARING
- **P & M Reis Trucking, Inc. - 10 Green Meadows**
  SEE PUBLIC HEARING

Motion/Vote: Mr. Rector moved to approve and endorse all the ANR applications listed above except for 156 & 158 Cliff Road, 10 Surfside Drive, 68 Fairgrounds Road and 10 Green Meadows, which will be reviewed during the public hearing process, in accordance with the recommendations in the staff report. The motion was duly seconded by Mr. Trudel and the motion was carried unanimously 4-0.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
John Trudel *Aye*
Barry Rector *Aye*
Vice-Chair Topham *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Chair Iverson *Aye*

VI. Previous Plans:

- **60-62 Walsh Street,** *modification to a previously approved second dwelling*

Voting: David Iverson (Chair), Joseph Topham (Vice-Chair), John Trudel, Nat Lowell, and Barry Rector
Alternates: Stephen Welch, and Abby De Molina
Recused: None
Documentation: File with associated plans, photos and required documentation
Activated: None
Representing: Lisa Botticelli
Discussion: The Board members discussed that the material on the driveway had been installed incorrectly. The original approval was for Belgian block however the material was changed to shell.

There was a suggestion to go on a site visit. The Board wanted the driveway in question to have similar features to the neighboring driveways to maintain consistency in the area.

Motion/Vote: Mr. Lowell made a motion to mimic the design of adjacent driveways, specifically across from it, to create consistency and delineate the entrance from the road. The motion was duly seconded by Vice-Chair Topham, and the motion was carried 4-1.

<u>Vote taken by Roll Call:</u>
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Vice-Chair Topham *Aye*
Barry Rector *Aye*
John Trudel *Nay*
Chair Iverson *Aye*

- **10 Industry Road, LLC and Strang Excavation & Concrete, LLC - 10 Industry Road,** *minor modification*

Voting: David Iverson (Chair), Joseph Topham (Vice-Chair), John Trudel, Nat Lowell, and Barry Rector
Alternates: Stephen Welch, and Abby De Molina
Recused: Vice-Chair Topham
Documentation: File with associated plans, photos and required documentation
Activated: None
Representing: Leo Asadoorian
Discussion: Mrs. Snell clarifies that appointing someone for this modification is not necessary, however they should make a finding that it doesn't require a public hearing as stated in the staff report.

Motion/Vote: Mr. Rector made a motion that this is a minor modification. The motion was duly seconded by Mr. Lowell and the motion carried unanimously.

<u>Vote taken by Roll Call:</u>
Barry Rector *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*
Chair Iverson *Aye*

Discussion: Mr. Asadorian explained that the site is shared between two companies, Reis Trucking and Strang Excavation. They need to add a second scale for weighing vehicles. They also plan to add additional paving to accommodate 18 wheelers.

Motion/Vote: Mr. Rector made a motion to accept the application as submitted allowing for the installation of a new scale while keeping previous conditions in effect, that the application does not require a public hearing per staff recommendation and condition outlined in the staff report. The motion was duly seconded by Mr. Lowell and the motion was carried unanimously 4-0.

<u>Vote taken by Roll Call:</u>
Barry Rector *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*
Chair Iverson *Aye*

- **Clay Street Subdivision,** *Request Select Board to take road easement*

Voting: David Iverson (Chair), Joseph Topham (Vice-Chair), John Trudel, Nat Lowell, and Barry Rector
Alternates: Stephen Welch, and Abby De Molina

Recused: Vice-Chair Topham
Documentation: File with associated plans, photos and required documentation
Activated: None
Representing: None
Discussion: Mrs. Trudel stated that there is a deadline approaching pursuant to the original subdivision decision for the Planning Board to request that the Select Board acquire rights in Clay Street. This request is essential to obtain an easement and rights in Clay Street, however no immediate construction is planned. The purpose is to allow for potential future connections. If the Town doesn't proceed with accepting the easement, it could potentially be developed by others. It was also mentioned that this doesn't have to be a roadway structure, but a pedestrian easement would suffice. There was a brief discussion of the presence of boats on the left-hand side of the property. Mrs. Snell mentioned an enforcement order was issued to the site.

Motion/Vote: Mr. Rector made a motion to formally request to the Select Board for an easement for the rights on Clay Street. The motion was duly seconded by Mr. Lowell and the motion was carried unanimously 5-0. seconded by Mr. Lowell.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Barry Rector *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*
Vice-Chair Topham *Aye*
Chair Iverson *Aye*

VII. Public Hearings (Applications):

- **ACK Mid Island, LLC & ACK Offices, LLC – 18, 18A, 20, 22, 24 & 26 Sparks Avenue,** *action deadline 08-31-2023,* ***REQUEST TO CONTINUE***
- **John J. Calnan, Trustee, John J. Calnan 2015 Trust - 21 Brewster Road,** *action deadline 08-19-2023,* ***REQUEST TO CONTINUE***

Motion/Vote: Mr. Rector made a motion to approve the requested continued applications listed above. The motion was duly seconded by Mr. Lowell, and the motion was carried unanimously 5-0.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Barry Rector *Aye*
Vice-Chair Topham *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Chair Iverson *Aye*

- **40 OSR, LLC - 2A & 2B Forrest Avenue,** *action deadline 08-31-2023*

Voting: David Iverson (Chair), Joseph Topham (Vice-Chair), John Trudel, Nat Lowell, and Barry Rector
Alternates: Stephen Welch, and Abby De Molina
Recused: None
Documentation: File with associated plans, photos and required documentation
Activated: None
Representing: Art Gasbarro, Surveyor, Attorney Arthur Reade and Architect Matt MacEachern
Discussion: Attorney Reade clarified that there was confusion regarding the property name. The Chairman had referred to the applicant as 40 Old South Road LLC, but the correct name is 40 OSR LLC. Attorney Reade explained that 40 Old South Road LLC is the adjacent property that had been recently approved for a Thai restaurant. Attorney Reade said the entire property was originally known as 40 Old South Road and was later subdivided. The group that owns properties at 2 and 2B Forrest Avenue was initially formed when the entire property was a single parcel and was named 40 OSR LLC. Attorney Reade wanted to clarify this distinction to avoid any further confusion.

Attorney Reade went on to say that the staff report has been updated to include additional materials related to drainage, lighting, and other engineering issues. He mentions the inclusion of increased open space and a request for a no parking sign along Forrest Avenue. Mr. Pesce has provided some comments that are considered relevant and appropriate. Attorney Reade suggests that the remaining issues to address are obtaining a certificate of water quality compliance and resolving engineering concerns that will be addressed in the final plans before obtaining a building permit or starting construction. Attorney Reade request that after the Board hears all the information, the hearing should be closed with a provision that requires the submission of plans addressing the mentioned issues and the certificate of water quality compliance to the Planning Staff for review and approval before the permit is issued. Mr. Trudel stated that they have already had extensive discussions on the topic in previous meetings, so they are not starting from scratch. Mr. Trudel acknowledged that the applicants have been cooperative and open to suggestions and changes. He wanted to make it clear to the public that they are comfortable with many of the modifications made by the applicants. Chair Iverson opened the floor to the public. Deborah Holdgate expresses that she is surprised that Attorney Reade's request to proceed without the submission of plans. She voices her concern about moving forward without proper documentation. She specifically mentions the absence of plans for the apartments and parking garage. Mrs. Trudel clarifies that all the plans have been reviewed and the only remaining question is regarding the specific plans for the parking garage. She mentions that although it was previously mentioned that there would be six two-bedroom apartments, the plans in the packet show four three-bedroom apartments. Mrs. Trudel points out that regardless of the apartment configuration the total number of bedrooms remains the same, which affects the parking calculation. Mrs. Trudel stated that the issue can be addressed at the staff level. Matt MacEachern clarifies that their ultimate intention is to have three two-bedroom apartments. However, due to the modular construction process they are still finalizing the layouts. Mr. MacEachern assures the Board that the total bedroom count will not change from what is currently shown on the plans. He said they plan to reconfigure the apartments accordingly. Ms. Holdgate expresses confusion because the original plan mentioned twelve bedrooms, but she heard Mr. MacEachern mention six bedrooms. She also raises a question about shared parking with 40 Old South Road, stating that 40 Old South Road does not have any additional parking to share with the Forest Avenue project. Attorney Reade responded clarifying that there is no shared parking between the Forest Avenue project and 40 Old South Road. The shared aspect relates to access such as the driveway, sidewalk, and footpath. The parking for the two parcels is separate, and they do not anticipate any challenges for patrons using the respective parking spaces. Chair Iverson suggests that the document in the packet may mention shared spaces with 40 Old South Road, but they do not consider it as a formal shared parking. Ms. Holdgate expresses hesitance to leave the Zoom meeting to search for the document in the packet but mentions that it states shared space with 40 Old South. Mr. Trudel explains that in previous discussions the applicants have consistently maintained the required parking spaces individually. He said that the comments about accessibility and potentially opening spaces were meant to explore the possibility of a communal arrangement, like the situation in Mid Island where neighboring businesses share parking. Mr. Trudel emphasizes that it is a friendly arrangement and compares it to the informal parking arrangements at Stop and Shop when customers park in spaces designated for nearby restaurants. Mr. Trudel acknowledges Ms. Holgate's concerns and notes that although there may have been updated information in a 120-page document it was not a demand from the Planning Board. Ms. Holdgate expresses her gratitude for having her concerns noted. Sandra London asked a question about outdoor dining. She mentions seeing a covered space but is unsure if there are windows in front of it. She also notes the presence of tables in that area and seeks clarification on whether it is an outdoor patio or a covered space. Mr. MacEachern responded that currently there are no plans for outdoor dining service in those areas. He confirms that there will not be any dining taking place under the covered space mentioned. Mrs. Trudel explains that the packet includes all past documents and submissions so if there were tables shown in a previous version of the plan it would still be present in the packet for reference and tracking progress. However, the plan currently shown on the screen represents the latest proposal after evolving through previous meetings. does not include tables in the covered patio space. Mrs. Trudel clarified that if there is going to be any outdoor dining it will require further approval unless it is explicitly conditioned otherwise. The seating cannot exceed the total approved seats without returning to the Board for additional relief.

Ms. Lundon expressed her concern about the potential impact of outdoor seating on noise, especially with a neighboring Thai restaurant. She suggests that if outdoor seating is to be considered it should come back to the Board for discussion and approval, as the impact on noise and neighboring properties is unknown. The Board members acknowledge Ms. Lundon's concerns and confirm that unless conditioned differently the restaurant would have to seek further approval if they decided to reallocate seats for outdoor dining. Ms. Lundon reiterated that her main concern is noise. Attorney Reade agreed to a condition for no outdoor service without further hearing before the Planning Board.

Motion/Vote: Mr. Trudel made a motion to close the public hearing. The motion was duly seconded by Mr. Topham and the motion was carried unanimously.

<u>Vote taken by Roll Call:</u>
John Trudel *Aye*
Vice-Chair Topham *Aye*
Barry Rector *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Chair Iverson *Aye*

Mr. Trudel mentioned there has been ongoing discussion for some time with preliminary discussions with Attorney Reade and staff.

Motion/Vote: Mr. Trudel made a motion to approve the application based on various conditions and requirements outlined in the staff report including receiving of border quality and detailed landscaping plans, certificate of Water Compliance, addressing Mr. Pesce's updated comments. The motion was duly seconded by Mr. Lowell and the motion was carried unanimously 5-0.

<u>Vote taken by Roll Call:</u>
John Trudel *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Vice-Chair Topham *Aye*
Barry Rector *Aye*
Chair Iverson *Aye*

- **41 WMR Trust - 41 West Miacomet Road,** *action deadline 08-31-2023*

Voting: David Iverson (Chair), Joseph Topham (Vice-Chair), John Trudel, Nat Lowell, and Barry Rector
Alternates: Stephen Welch, Carl Borchert and Abby De Molina
Recused: None
Documentation: File with associated plans, photos and required documentation
Activated: None
Representing: Attorney Steven Cohen and Dan Mulloy, Surveyor
Discussion: Most of the alterations are related to the façade and there's no increase in ground cover. There's a reduction in the size of the stoops, patios, and impervious surfaces. A shed of 120 square feet has been removed and is planned to be replaced with a 200 square foot shed. The Cabana Pavilion that was proposed earlier has been deemed undesirable and has been removed from consideration. The size of the pool has been reduced to 14 by 30 feet. The pool equipment that was initially planned to be located behind the Cabana is now proposed to be placed somewhere else. The pool location has been changed to an underground basement space beneath the proposed shed instead of being behind the Cabana. Re-vegetation of a disturbed area is now proposed to cover 9,471 square feet, a significant amount compared to other similar permits. A minor modification is requested for the driveway which would decrease the visibility of the house from public view and include curve screening. The modification is requested for a driveway has been adjusted to address concerns raised by the neighbors about headlights affecting their property. The presence of

endangered species in the area is not a concern as it's primarily scrub Oak rather than Moorlands area and any proposed driveway adjustments wouldn't involve destroying moorlands. The driveway adjustment is suggested as a potential benefit to both the homeowners and the public, enhancing screening of the house from the road. Proposed conditions include ceasing chemical treatment to the pool 21 days before draining to allow water to return to its natural state. No pool water discharge onto the property draining would be done by truck and treated at a wastewater facility. Exterior lighting limited to pool requirements, an auto cover for the pool suggested to reduce impact when not in use. Mechanical equipment located within structures or behind fences for noise reduction. Use of low decibel pool equipment. Use of construction fencing or other markings to demarcate construction limits during the building process. No construction between a specified period in the summer typically between June 15th and September 15th. Prioritizing use of construction spoils for topsoil fill to minimize invasive seed introduction. Limited use of screen loam for soil needs as the quantity required is expected to be small. Reference to the relevant regulations including requirement to minimize adverse impacts on the environment and scenic integrity. Conduction site plan reviews to safeguard endangered plants and animals limit construction timing and preserve scenic views. There was mention of four other recently approved pool permits with minimal or no conditions and unanimous approvals by the Board members. Attorney Cohen pointed out that when the Board reviewed other applications involving pools it concluded that its standards and performance criteria could be met with mitigation measures much less extensive than what is currently proposed. He clarified that precedent doesn't dictate that past approvals must be repeated but stressed that consistency in adhering to performance standards and guidelines is important. Attorney Cohen mentioned that he received a "no take" letter from the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MDEP) and the Fisheries and Wildlife Division which oversees the Mass Endangered Species Act (MESA) programs. The letter included only one condition, the installation of physical barriers and demarcations to ensure that construction remains within the designated work resource area. Attorney Cohen emphasized that the proposed work raises no concerns if the defined work area is adequately protected. He stated that the proposed project has been reviewed by experts and has received endorsements that address potential environmental issues. Attorney Cohen stressed that these factors should provide reassurance to the Board regarding the project's environmental impact. Mr. Trudel expressed doubts about how the current pool proposal aligns with these performance standards. He argued that even if the size were reduced to that of a hot tub it would still disrupt the property within the district. Mr. Trudel stated that his stance would remain negative towards the application regardless of how many times it's revised and reduced in size. Mr. Rector acknowledged the applicant's effort to address concerns regarding the driveway but indicated he had reservations. He stated he was troubled by certain aspects and proceeded to inquire about specific details related to ground cover and square footage. Mr. Rector emphasized the importance of the total allowable ground cover area for the lot in terms of square feet including the area available to construct structures on the lot in question. Mr. Rector questioned the nature of the materials and mentioned that most pools they've dealt with are usually made of cement. Mr. Trudel interjected to clarify that Mr. Rector might be referring to the coping around the pool. He explained that the coping extends about two feet on each side. Vice-Chair Topham said that he was becoming less supportive of such proposals due to increasing disruption caused by the construction in the area. Chair Iverson opened the floor to the public. Attorney Whitney Gifford stated that the current application is situated in a different part of the MMD compared to two previous applications like Walbang and Cudweed. He emphasized that the current area around Ahab Drive and Davis Lane is denser with smaller lots that were developed under the constraints of the MMD regulations. Attorney Gifford explained that these lots in the current area are distinct being set among existing trees and having different characteristics compared to the larger more open lots like those on West Miacomet Avenue. Attorney Gifford highlighted a difference between the current application and the one at 52 West Miacomet that there was an existing hot tub on a deck and the applicant emphasized a medical need for water therapy. Attorney Gifford stated that this medical need is not evident in the current proposal. He raised concerns about the proposed screening for the larger lots in the current area. He suggested that the amount of screening proposed might stand out significantly due to the lower scrub and vegetation in this zone compared to the other side of the MMD. Attorney Gifford mentioned a concern raised by a neighbor regarding the proposed white shell material for the driveway. He suggested that using stone gravel instead could help minimize the visual impact of the driveway both when viewed from West Miacomet and from across the pond. Emily Molden from Nantucket Land Council expressed that in the past the Nantucket Land Council had stated that the proposed pool application does not meet the standards of the MMD. She stated that it's not only about visible impacts but also about potential adverse effects associated with the proposed pool such as noise, lighting and future maintenance and the proximity of Miacomet Pond. Ms. Molden acknowledged that the state's natural heritage agency has issued a "no take" determination for the project. However, she reminded the Board that Nantucket's zoning bylaws have different standards compared to the state agency's criteria. Ms. Molden questioned whether the applicant has already maximized their ground cover on the site. Ms. Molden questioned whether the 200 square foot shed, usually not considered ground cover, would also be included in ground cover calculations within the MMD. Tom Barada brought attention to a letter written by Attorney Cohen stating that no exterior mechanical work should take place from June to September. He compared this suggestion with a previous instance related to 37 West Miacomet where no work at all was allowed on site during periods due to noise concerns. He emphasized that the Harbor House project also had requirements to limit exterior work during construction due to noise issues. Mr. Barada reminded the Board that there is precedent for restricting construction activities during summer months, whether the work is interior or exterior. Mr. Barada addressed the elevation of the driveway and parking area, pointing out that they are at a high point on the lot. He brought up an earlier suggestion to have Attorney Cohen discuss the driveway issue with neighbors or homeowner's association. Mr. Barada reiterated the issue of pool equipment location and stressed the holistic view of the Moorland environment. John Barada introduced himself as a co-manager of 39 West Miacomet Road LLC and a neighboring property owner. He shared the history of the area and discussed how the MMD was established to protect the area. He expressed concerns about the ecological stress the area has endured. Mr. Barada expressed opposition to the installation of pools and construction features that don't blend subtly into the natural beauty of the area. Mr. Barada argued that introducing high-growing vegetation for pools would alter the unique character of the region. He also expressed opposition to the proposal for a white shell parking area and turnaround located on the highest point in the MMD district. Mr. Barada asked the Board to vote against the applicant's proposal for a pool and an expansive shell turnaround drive. Chris Donelan expressed support for the comments made by John Barada, Joe and Barry regarding the proposal. Ms. Donelan emphasized the significance of the area they live in and the desire to preserve its special nature. Mr. Borchert acknowledged his role as a non-voting alternate on the Board but emphasized that the Planning Board serves as the Special Granting authority with the power to interpret zoning bylaws and consider neighbor concerns. He expressed concerns of the neighbors and shared the same feelings to preserve the scenic beauty of the area. Vice-Chair Topham asked for approval and disapprovals related to the pool applications for both sides of the matter. He expressed the importance of having this information. Mrs. Trudel responded by stating that sometimes applications aren't explicitly denied but are instead withdrawn without prejudice to avoid formal denial filings.

Motion/Vote: Mr. Rector moved to continue this application to the August meeting. Point of order Mr. Trudel stated that he will not be at the August meeting. The motion was duly seconded by Vice-Chair Topham, and the motion was carried unanimously 5-0.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Barry Rector *Aye*
Vice-Chair Topham *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*
Chair Iverson *Aye*

- **The Westmoor Club - 105 W. Chester Street, 109 W. Chester Street & 10 Westmoor Lane,** *action deadline 08-31-*2023
  Voting: John Trudel, Nat Lowell, Stephen Welch, Carl Borchert and Barry Rector

  Alternates: Abby De Molina
  Recused: David Iverson (Chair), Joseph Topham (Vice-Chair),
  Documentation: File with associated plans, photos and required documentation
  Activated: None
  Representing: Attorney Steven Cohen and Surveyor Paul Santos
  Discussion: Attorney Cohen provided a summary of the project. Attorney Cohen stated that they have significantly reduced the size of these structures and have been working to address concerns from the neighbors, however the neighbors remain unsatisfied with the proposed project. The vernal pool, the initial calculations were adjusted due to additional rainwater revealing a larger pool. The plan has been modified to align with these changes and adjustments to wetland permits are necessary. Attorney Cohen stated that the land where the cottage is planned is not pristine but is located adjacent to a tennis court that is currently approved for use as a putting green. The request is to repurpose this area for a cottage, and it is surrounded by significant screening provided by a dozen to twenty large trees. The proposed cottage would not be obtrusive. The cottage would serve as employee housing and would not be used for short-term rental or long-term rentals, it remains as single-family housing. There are ample parking spaces with approximately 176 parking spaces available. Attorney Cohen stated that the Club operates with no noise complaints, zoning problems and nuisances have been mitigated since the implementation of new rules in 2018. An audit of existing conditions and drainage information has been submitted to the Board. Emergency vehicle access and drainage have been addressed to satisfy the Board's needs and questions. The proposed emergency vehicle access will be fenced off and used exclusively for emergency purposes. Mr. Santos stated that he provided Planning staff with the plans and stormwater reports submitted to the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) for review and approval. He stated that measures have been taken to meet state and local regulations, including the addition of a sprinkler system, extending the water main, and providing a fire hydrant. The access will be created along the northern boundary of the property instead of upgrading the existing driveway. Mr. Trudel stated that a request was made in the previous meeting for a site visit and a detailed tour of the proposed development. Mr. Trudel provided positive feedback and the lack of major concerns during the site visit. Mr. Borchert found the project to have minimal impacts and with potential noise mitigation measures in place he felt that the concerns with the neighbors could be reasonably addressed. Chair Iverson opened the floor to the public. Attorney Sarah Alger and Attorney Dan Bailey representing several neighbors and abutters to the project. Attorney Alger expressed concern and frustration among the neighbors due to the late submission of materials and a lack of opportunity to review them before the meeting and suggested that this meeting be continued to the next meeting. Attorney Dan Bailey acknowledged the proposed emergency access as an improvement for safety but expressed the need for more details and clarifications regarding the project's compliance with various requirements and regulations. Virginia Chase expressed concerns about the buffer around the Westmoor Club which she believes is no longer in place. She also mentioned being surprised by the statement that there have been no noise complaints. She expressed that the expansion of the club is a problem for the neighbors, and she urged the Board to consider the neighbor's perspective in their decision making. She is opposed to the proposed cottage and suggested moving the paddleball courts away from residential areas to address noise issues. Jane Gaito at 92 Cliff Road expressed the importance of transparency and compliance in the application process. She also expressed disappointment that the Planning Board had requested a compliance review in the previous meeting, yet it had not been shared. Chair Iverson acknowledges the need for a compliance review; however, the Planning Staff have not had an opportunity to conduct it yet due to staffing issues. Francis Farrell echoed Attorney Alger's concerns about a lack of access to the detailed drawings and materials submitted and he urged the Boad to explore the possibility of modifying the existing driveway to satisfy the fire department's requirements rather than proceeding with the proposed new driveway, citing concerns about cost, intrusiveness, and the impact on vegetation.

Peter Halle urged the Board to postpone their decision until all required information, especially from the fire department, emphasizing concerns about safety and the incomplete current plans. Thomas Holland raised concerns about transparency and discrepancies related to environmental issues, suggesting more details are needed before proceeding with the decision-making process. Jean-

Francois Formela expressed concerns about open space, compliance, housing needs, access during construction, enforcement of covenants and tree preservation regarding the proposed development. Attorney Cohen clarified aspects related to open space, enforcement, transparency, and housing compliance to address these issues within its standard procedures. Attorney Cohen provided explanations and clarifications regarding housing, professional reputation, adjustments to plans and emergency vehicle access. Attorney Cohen urged the Board to close the public hearing and issue a decision with appropriate conditions unless there is outstanding information. Mr. Welch briefly discussed restrictions on the dwelling, addressing noise concerns, compliance and clarifications needed from the fire department. Mr. Lowell provided an overall perspective on the situation indicating his support for continuing the discussion. Mr. Rector expressed concerns about the ongoing process which he feels might need to be extended by two months. He emphasized the importance of public engagement and transparency, and that the public should have sufficient time to review information before decisions are made. Attorney Cohen requested a continuance to the August meeting. There was a brief discussion about having the proposed conditions available in advance for public review and input and the importance of timely document submission to staff to avoid delays in the process. There was concern about the number of Board members present. Mrs. Trudel stated that they could work out the details and ensure a quorum for the next meeting.

Motion/Vote: Mr. Rector moved to continue the meeting to August. The motion was duly seconded by Mr. Trudel and the motion was carried unanimously 5-0.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Barry Rector *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*
Carl Borchert Aye
Stephen Welch Aye
Nat Lowell *Aye*

Mr. Borchert asked if he needed to stay for the remainder of the meeting since he had only been present for the Westmoor Club portion. Mrs. Trudel confirmed that he did not need to stay, and Mr. Borchert expressed his farewell to the Board stating that he will be leaving the meeting. Mr. Borchert left the meeting at 7:17pm.

- **Nantucket Old South LLC Subdivision, 33 Old South Road,** *action deadline 08-23-2023*

Voting: David Iverson (Chair), Joseph Topham (Vice-Chair), John Trudel, Nat Lowell, and Barry Rector
Alternates: Stephen Welch, Carl Borchert let meeting at 7:17PM and Abby De Molina
Recused: None
Documentation: File with associated plans, photos and required documentation
Activated: None
Representing: Attorney Rick Beaudette and Art Gasbarro, Surveyor
Discussion: Attorney Beaudette acknowledged that Cliff Shore was absent due to a flight. Attorney Beaudette submitted a revised plan late and explained that they had been working on it with their client and staff the previous week. He acknowledged that the Board members and Mr. Pesci hadn't seen the updated plan yet. This is a thirteen-lot subdivision in the R-5 zoning district with twelve buildable lots and one roadway lot. They increased the proposed roadway layout to 22 feet with a 12-foot traveled surface including a 10-foot parking area along the road and added a five-foot multiuse path on the right side as suggested by staff. Attorney Beaudette stated that

there is a difference from the staff's recommendation. Instead of placing the multi-use path within the lots easement they placed it on the right side along the parking area. Attorney Beaudette stated that there was a discussion with staff last week about a recommendation for a two-way roadway on the northerly end adjacent to the CN property to the north. Attorney Beaudette explained that they didn't incorporate this recommendation into the plan. They wanted to maintain the roadway as one-way because the CN property was expected to have mostly residential apartments and they wanted to separate any commercial activity from their residential subdivision. He said that they intend to keep the entire traffic lane as one way on the north side, the proposed one-way roadway traveling from Ticcoma Way to Young's Way. There were additional changes made such as a reduction in parking spaces and the inclusion of landscape bump outs instead of parking in certain areas on the roadway following staff suggestions. Increased the sidewalk width to a five-foot multi-use path based on the Boar's input. Shared driveways leading to the lots were added with potential reconfiguration in mind. Stop signs were added at the intersection of Young's Way and Young's Way was widened to twenty-two feet within the layout. The multi-use path continued behind the CN property to avoid crossing Young's Way or interfering with future curb cuts that will eventually be on Young's Way. Attorney Beaudette expressed their hope to implement these improvements in a phase two plan which would eventually come before the Board for the CN property. Chair Iverson opened the floor to the public. Attorney Arthur Reade stated that he had no objection to the project itself and expressed his support for housing development in the neighborhood. He expressed concern regarding the direction of traffic in the proposed one-way section of the roadway. He also suggested that this should have a name other than "Young's Way" to avoid confusion and issues for emergency responders. Attorney Reade explained that the problem was the difficulty of making a left turn from Young's Way onto Old South Road especially during the busy summer months when traffic on Old South Road was high. Mr. Lowell questioned whether the direction of the road could be reversed if needed and concerned with on-street parking. Mr. Trudel emphasized the importance of considering future developments in the area, especially commercial lots. Vice-Chair Topham disagreed with the current road design and direction. He suggested that a sidewalk should be placed in front of the houses for safety and curb appeal. He proposed changing the direction of the road so that it leads to Ticcoma Way and suggested the installation of speed bumps or elevated walkways to deter commercial trucks from using the residential road. Mr. Rector agrees with Vice-Chairman Topham's suggestion to reverse the flow of traffic. He believes that this would be more efficient traffic flow solution especially during the morning traffic heading into Town. Mr. Rector raised a question regarding the number of dwellings proposed per lot and whether there were any restrictions in place. Attorney Beaudette responded that they hadn't considered restricting the construction in any way. Michael O'mara a resident at 35A Old South Road expressed concerns were limited to the use of Young's Way as the primary exit for the property but had no issues with using Young's Way as an approach. The discussion addressed various concerns and considerations related to the proposed development, including traffic flow and design details.

Motion/Vote: Mr. Rector moved to continue this application to the August 14th meeting. The motion was duly seconded by Mr. Trudel, and the motion was carried unanimously 5-0.

<u>Vote taken by Roll Call:</u>
Barry Rector *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*

Vice-Chair Topham *Aye*
Chair Iverson *Aye*

- **Davkim Smiley LLC - 10 & 12 Davkim Lane,** *action deadline 09-10-2023*

Voting: David Iverson (Chair), Joseph Topham (Vice-Chair), John Trudel, Nat Lowell, and Barry Rector
Alternates: Stephen Welch, and Abby De Molina
Recused: None
Documentation: File with associated plans, photos and required documentation
Activated: None
Representing: Attorney Arthur Reade Ryan Maxwell and Don Bracken, Surveyor
Discussion: Attorney Reade provided updated plans detailing the hours of operation with the facility being open to the public from 6AM to 9PM. Provide plans for a security system and access gate. An updated landscape plan with additional trees added at the rear of the site to improve screening. Attorney Reade expressed concerns regarding the staff report recommendation about making improvements at the intersection of Davkim and Lovers Lane. He mentioned a deed restriction that prohibits them from using Davkim Lane for access to or from Lovers Lane. Attorney Reade stated that he had inquired about the restriction and spoke with Richmond's Council to get background information. The restriction was imposed when Richmond sold the property to the present ownership. It was agreed that access would be via Ironwood Road which becomes Nancy Ann Lane as it passes toward the back of the property. Attorney Reade stated that there isn't much traffic on Lover's Lane in the area due to ponding of water near intersection of Lovers Lane and Davkim Lane caused by retaining walls. The restriction was imposed in response to neighbors' opposition to commercial traffic coming down Lover's Lane as they wanted to maintain the quiet residential character of the area. Attorney Reade stated that they will contribute to installing a new water main that would serve their property and potentially benefit other properties in the area. Mr. Lowell asked when the deed restriction was put in place. Attorney Reade stated that the restriction was relatively new, about two years ago. Mrs. Trudel stated that this is not enforceable by the Town but rather a private deed restriction. The Board members discussed the difficulty of enforcing the private deed restriction and suggested that the applicant might contribute to the improvements given the increased traffic anticipated due to the proposed facility being open to the public. Mrs. Trudel mentioned that she would not be available for further discussion due to vacation but noted that Mike Burns is in contact with GPI, the consultant coordinating Lover's Lane improvements. There will be a call on Thursday involving Don Bracken, the applicant's representative, and Attorney Reade, suggested that further discussion should be held after that call. The Board suggested placing a "no left turn" sign at the exit to discourage traffic from entering Lover's Lane. There was further discussion revolved around finding a reasonable contribution from the Applicant to address the potential impact of their facility on Lover's Lane. Attorney Reade asked if they could propose a dollar amount. Chair Iverson suggested a $10,000 donation. Mrs. Trudel felt that the amount is appropriate. Chair Iverson questioned if f a housing management plan was needed for the duplex. Mrs. Trudel indicated that it likely wasn't necessary given the manager's occupancy and the restriction to year-round rentals. Chair Iverson opened the floor to the public. Victor Mudo expressed concern about stormwater management and its potential impact on a nearby stream by Davkim Lane. Mr. Bracken responded by stating that this issue had been addressed at the first meeting. He explained that all runoff generated by the site would be self-contained on the property and would not flow into the road. He mentioned the use of subsurface systems to manage stormwater.

Motion/Vote: Mr. Rector moved to close the public hearing. The motion was duly seconded by Vice-Chair Topham, and the motion was carried unanimously 5-0.

<u>Vote taken by Roll Call:</u>
Barry Rector *Aye*
Vice-Chair Topham *Aye*

John Trudel *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Chair Iverson *Aye*

Motion/Vote: Mr. Rector moved to approve the application with the contribution of $10,000, changes of hours of operation, updated landscape plan, access gates and landscape matters and year-round or peak season employee housing. The motion was duly seconded by Vice-Chair Topham, and the motion was carried unanimously 5-0.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Barry Rector *Aye*
Vice-Chair Topham *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Chair Iverson *Aye*

- **CRH 46 Surfside, LLC - 46 Surfside Road**, *action deadline 10-08-2023*

Voting: Voting: David Iverson (Chair), Joseph Topham (Vice-Chair), John Trudel, Nat Lowell, and Barry Rector
Alternates: Stephen Welch, and Abby De Molina
Recused: None
Documentation: File with associated plans, photos and required documentation
Activated: None
Representing: Attorney Sarah Alger and Surveyor, Paul Santos
Discussion: Due to changes in the construction process the apartment configuration had changed from two-bedroom apartments to a three-bedroom apartment and a studio. The original decision stated that the apartments would be rented in conjunction with contractor shops below but there was often no demand for contractor shop employees to use the housing. The proposal is seeking flexibility to rent the apartments for either employee housing or year-round housing with a prohibition on short-term rentals. The Board agreed with the proposed modifications. Chair Iverson opened the floor to the public.

Motion/Vote: Mr. Trudel moved to close the public hearing. The motion was duly seconded by Mr. Rector, and the motion was carried unanimously 5-0.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
John Trudel *Aye*
Barry Rector *Aye*
Vice-Chair Topham *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Chair Iverson *Aye*

Motion/Vote: Mr. Trudel moved to approve the Special Permit application with the staff recommendations and conditions outlined in the staff report. The motion was duly seconded by Vice-Chair Topham, and the motion was carried unanimously 5-0.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
John Trudel *Aye*
Vice-Chair Topham *Aye*
Barry Rector *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Chair Iverson *Aye*

- **Shawn E. Davis - 11 Equator Drive,** *action deadline 10-08-2023*

Voting: David Iverson (Chair), Joseph Topham (Vice-Chair), John Trudel, Nat Lowell, and Barry Rector
Alternates: Stephen Welch, and Abby De Molina
Recused: None
Documentation: File with associated plans, photos and required documentation
Activated: None
Representing: None
Discussion: This is a proposal for a simple covenant lot for a secondary residential lot. There is a request for a second driveway access even though there were already two-existing accesses in a horseshoe driveway configuration. Board members expressed concerns about flooding in the area. It was clarified that these concerns were not directly related to the Special Permit under consideration. The Board expressed support for the Special Permit application. Chair Iverson opened the floor to the public. There were no public comments.

Motion/Vote: Mr. Rector moved to close the public hearing. The motion was duly seconded by Mr. Trudel, and the motion was carried unanimously 5-0.

<u>Vote taken by Roll Call:</u>
Barry Rector *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*
Vice-Chair Topham *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Chair Iverson *Aye*

Motion/Vote: Mr. Trudel moved to approve the Special Permit application with the staff recommendations and conditions outlined in the staff report and request staff to collaborate with the applicant on the realignment of the curb cuts. The motion was duly seconded by Mr. Rector, and the motion was carried unanimously 5-0.

<u>Vote taken by Roll Call:</u>
John Trudel *Aye*
Barry Rector *Aye*
Vice-Chair Topham *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Chair Iverson *Aye*

- **156 Cliff Road Nominee Trust, Monica Halperin, Trustee and 158 Cliff Road Nominee Trust, Richard P. Beaudette, Trustee - 156 & 158 Cliff Road,** *action deadline 10-08-2023*

Voting: David Iverson (Chair), Joseph Topham (Vice-Chair), John Trudel, Nat Lowell, and Barry Rector
Alternates: Stephen Welch, and Abby De Molina
Recused: None
Documentation: File with associated plans, photos and required documentation
Activated: None
Representing: Dan Mulloy, Surveyor
Discussion: This is a three -lot rear subdivision. This plan has been approved as a four-lot definitive plan in the previous meeting with the fourth lot intended as a proof plan for the current three-lot proposal. Chair Iverson opened the floor to the public. There were no public comments.

Motion/Vote: Vice-Chair Topham moved to close the public hearing. The motion was duly seconded by Mr. Rector and the motion was carried unanimously 5-0.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Barry Rector *Aye*
Vice-Chair Topham *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Chair David Iverson *Aye*

Motion/Vote: Vice-Chair Topham moved to approve the Special Permit application with the staff recommendations and conditions outlined in the staff report. The motion was duly seconded by Mr. Rector and the motion was carried unanimously 5-0.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Barry Rector *Aye*
Vice-Chair Topham *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Chair David Iverson *Aye*

ANR:
156 Cliff Road Nominee Trust, Monica Halperin, Trustee and 158 Cliff Road Nominee Trust, Richard P. Beaudette, Trustee - 156 & 158 Cliff Road

Motion/Vote: Mr. Rector moved to approve the ANR application in accordance with the recommendations in the staff report. The motion was duly seconded by Vice-Chair Topham, and the motion was carried unanimously 5-0.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Barry Rector *Aye*
Vice-Chair Topham *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Chair David Iverson *Aye*

- **Reel Keeper, LLC –10 Surfside Drive,** *action deadline 10-08-2023*

Voting: David Iverson (Chair), Joseph Topham (Vice-Chair), John Trudel, Nat Lowell, and Barry Rector
Alternates: Stephen Welch, and Abby De Molina
Recused: None
Documentation: File with associated plans, photos and required documentation
Activated: None
Representing: Dan Mulloy, Surveyor and Attorney Cohen
Discussion: Mr. Mulloy stated that this application is identical to the previous application. At the last meeting the Board approved a two-lot definitive plan, and the current plan was intended as a proof plan for a two-lot rear subdivision. The staff's recommendations for conditions have been reviewed with no issues from the Applicant. Chair Iverson opened the floor to the public. There were no public comments.

Motion/Vote: Mr. Rector moved to close the public hearing. The motion was duly seconded by Vice-Chair Topham, and the motion was carried unanimously 5-0.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Barry Rector *Aye*
Vice-Chair Topham *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*

Nat Lowell *Aye*
Chair David Iverson *Aye*

Motion/Vote: Vice-Chair Topham moved to approve the Special Permit application based on the merits. The motion was duly seconded by Mr. Rector and the motion was carried unanimously 5-0.

<u>Vote taken by Roll Call:</u>
Vice-Chair Topham *Aye*
Barry Rector *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Chair David Iverson *Aye*

<u>ANR:</u>
Reel Keeper, LLC - 10 Surfside Drive

Motion/Vote: Mr. Rector moved to approve the ANR application in accordance with the recommendations in the staff report. The motion was duly seconded by Vice-Chair Topham, and the motion was carried unanimously 5-0.

<u>Vote taken by Roll Call:</u>
Barry Rector *Aye*
Vice-Chair Topham *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Chair David Iverson *Aye*

- **Joseph J. & Marcia J. Aguiar – 68 Fairgrounds Road,** *action deadline 10-08-2023*

Voting: David Iverson (Chair), Joseph Topham (Vice-Chair), John Trudel, Nat Lowell, and Barry Rector
Alternates: Stephen Welch, and Abby De Molina
Recused: None
Documentation: File with associated plans, photos and required documentation
Activated: None
Representing: Dan Mulloy, Surveyor and Attorney Cohen
Discussion: A proposed two lot rear subdivision. This application was similar to a previous meeting where the Board had approved a two-lot definitive plan. The changes were intended to make the subdivision more aesthetically pleasing and functional. Chair Iverson opened the floor to the public.

Motion/Vote: Mr. Rector moved to close the public hearing. The motion was duly seconded by Mr. Trudel and the motion was carried unanimously 5-0.

<u>Vote taken by Roll Call:</u>
Barry Rector *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*
Vice-Chair Topham *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Chair David Iverson *Aye*

Motion/Vote: Mr. Trudel moved to approve the Special Permit application with the findings and conditions outlined in the staff report. The motion was duly seconded by Vice-Chair Topham, and the motion was carried unanimously 5-0.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
John Trudel *Aye*
Vice-Chair Topham *Aye*
Barry Rector *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Chair David Iverson *Aye*

ANR:
Joseph J. & Marcia J. Aguiar - 68 Fairgrounds Road

Motion/Vote: Mr. Trudel moved to approve the ANR application in accordance with the recommendations in the staff report. The motion was duly seconded by Mr. Rector and the motion was carried unanimously 5-0.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
John Trudel *Aye*
Barry Rector *Aye*
Vice-Chair Topham *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Chair David Iverson *Aye*

- **P & M Reis Trucking, Inc. – MJ Way Subdivision, 10 Green Meadows,** *action deadline 10-08-2023*
  Voting: David Iverson (Chair), Joseph Topham (Vice-Chair), John Trudel, Nat Lowell, and Barry Rector
  Alternates: Stephen Welch, and Abby De Molina
  Recused: None
  Documentation: File with associated plans, photos and required documentation
  Activated: None
  Representing: Dan Mulloy, Surveyor
  Discussion: Mr. Mulloy stated that this relates to a two-lot rear subdivision special permit application. Mr. Mulloy stated that the Board reviewed a draft plan in the previous meeting and is now presenting the same plan for consideration. Staff comments and conditions have been reviewed with no major concerns except for an open-ended condition related to screening. Chair Iverson questioned whether the existing vegetation and six-foot board fence were adequate screening for the property line. The Board expressed concerns about one property, Cindy Clarkson's. Mr. Mulloy stated that he had visited the site and expressed concerns about the lack of screening for Cindy Clarkson's property. He suggested adding a fence or other screening measures to address the issue. Myle Reis reached an agreement to put a fence up which can be added as a condition in the decision. Chair Iverson opened the floor to the public. There was no public comment.

Motion/Vote: Vice-Chair Topham moved to close the public hearing. The motion was duly seconded by Mr. Rector and the motion was carried unanimously 5-0.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Vice-Chair Topham *Aye*
Barry Rector *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*

Nat Lowell *Aye*
Chair David Iverson *Aye*

Motion/Vote: Vice-Chair Topham moved to approve the Special Permit application with conditions added regarding planting, and that the applicant install fence and screening. The motion was duly seconded by Mr. Lowell and the motion was carried unanimously 5-0.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Vice-Chair Topham *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Barry Rector *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*
Chair David Iverson *Aye*

ANR:
P & M Reis Trucking, Inc. - 10 Green Meadows
BR/NL
Motion/Vote: Mr. Rector moved to approve the ANR application in accordance with the recommendations in the staff report. The motion was duly seconded by Mr. Lowell and the motion was carried unanimously 5-0.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Barry Rector *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Vice-Chair Topham *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*
Chair David Iverson *Aye*

VIII. Public Comment *for items not listed on the agenda*
No comment

IX. Other Business:

- **Planning Board regular meeting – Monday, August 14, 2023, at 4PM via Zoom**

X. Adjournment:
Mr. Rector made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:47PM. The motion was duly seconded by Mr. Trudel, and the motion was carried unanimously.

Vote taken by Roll Call:
Barry Rector *Aye*
John Trudel *Aye*
Vice-Chair Topham *Aye*
Nat Lowell *Aye*
Chair David Iverson *Aye*

Submitted by: Catherine Ancero