

PLANNING BOARD

DATE: March 14, 2024

TIME: 6:00 P.M.

PLACE: Large Meeting Room/Zoom

FOR: Regular Meeting/Public Hearings

PRESENT: Brandee Nelson, Chair; Pedro Pachano; Jonathan Hankin; Malcolm Fick;
Jeremy Higa
Jackie Kain, Associate Member
Chris Rembold, Assistant Town Manager/Director of Planning and Development

Mr. Pachano called the meeting to order at 6:02 P.M. Ms. Nelson had not yet arrived. He read the opening statement. He said the meeting was being recorded. Mr. Pachano also read Section 241-1 of the Town Code.

FORM A PLANS:

There were no Form As.

MINUTES: FEBRUARY 22, 2024 & FEBRUARY 29, 2024

Mr. Hankin made a motion to approve as amended, the minutes of February 22, 2024, Mr. Fick seconded, all in favor.

Mr. Hankin made a motion to approve as amended, the minutes of February 29, 2024, Mr. Fick seconded, all in favor.

PUBLIC HEARING: ZONING AMENDMENTS

Mr. Hankin made a motion to open the public hearing, Mr. Fick seconded, all in favor. The public hearing was opened at 6:06 PM.

Mr. Rembold said all proposed zoning amendments are submitted to the Planning Board then forwarded to the Select Board that sends them back to the Planning Board to hold a public hearing. There are three amendments submitted by the Planning Board and a Citizen's Petition. The Citizen's Petition consists of three submittals that were the same so they were combined into one petition.

The Board decided to have Mr. Rembold present the amendments prior to discussion. The Planning Board amendments were present first then the Citizen's Petition.

- i. Amend the Bylaw by adding a new residential use, Coliving Residential Development and establishing a definition, use permissions and other requirements

Mr. Rembold said coliving consists of smaller units with shared kitchens and common space. Generally, the construction costs are lower so more units are created at lower rents. Several housing groups have done or are seeking to do coliving in former hotels.

- ii. (out of agenda order) Amend Section 3.1.4, the Table of Use Regulations, rows A(1), (2), (3) and (7) regarding single, two and multi-unit residential development and mixed use development and development in certain zones.

Mr. Rembold said the amendment allows for by-right multi-unit development and mixed use in more areas and some uses by special permit in other areas

- iii. Amend Section 6.3.5 regarding landscaping and trees

Mr. Rembold said the intent of the amendment is to require plantings and trees to be replaced when they don't survive.

- iv. The Citizen's Petition is to amend the Zoning Map on Silver Street to change the zoning of parcels, 6, 7A and 7C on the Assessor's Map 24 from R-2 acreage residential to MXD, mixed use.

Linda Shafiroff and Sarah Stiner, from Blackwater Realty, were present to discuss the Citizen's Petition.

Ms. Shafiroff said the reason for the petition is to allow more density on our lot and the lot next to us. She said the area is covered by four zones. The properties are within walking distance to the stores and bus line. She said her property was bought knowing there is a lot that can be done but the goal is to provide work force housing. More density could allow for more development of work force housing.

Mr. Rembold said three land owners submitted petitions that were procedurally the same so the three petitions were grouped as one petition.

Ms. Shafiroff said she spoke with the neighbors and worked with them to put the language together. She said MXD allows for commercial uses. We would like to have a deed restriction on the property that there won't be any commercial uses.

Mr. Pachano asked if that is part of the proposal. He said it isn't codified in the zoning bylaws. He asked if the proposal needs to be held until a deed restriction is put on the property.

Mr. Rembold said he didn't know if it needed to be held.

Ms. Shafiroff said the MXD requires Site Plan Review. She said it can be applied to us at that point.

Mr. Pachano said if there isn't a deed restriction recorded who will remember when we are all gone. He said the change is being offered to make a change that will be better for the neighborhood. He suggested working it out.

Ms. Nelson arrived at 6:21 PM. Mr. Pachano turned the Chair over to Ms. Nelson.

Ms. Nelson opened the discussion of the amendments up to the public. Fred Clark, 388 Park Street N., asked how an existing apartment would be treated under the coliving bylaw. Would it allow single apartments or would fire walls be required.

Ms. Nelson said there would be a single use within a structure. It would be evaluated as a standalone condition.

Mr. Clark said there are two properties to be used for coliving. He asked how a separate owner's apartment would be considered.

Ms. Nelson said that is a good point. We will make a note of it.

Mr. Fick asked if it would be prohibited by the bylaw.

Mr. Hankin said no.

Richard Stanley, from Egremont, said as the coliving bylaw relates to the Thornewood Inn, he didn't understand why a special permit would be needed in the B-2-A zone.

Ms. Nelson said the Table of Use Regulations shows the use to be by-right in the B-2-A zone.

Mr. Rembold shared the screen showing the Table of Use.

Mr. Stanley said he supports the change and is glad the changes are being made to allow for this housing. He said coliving is the gateway for more work force housing.

There were no additional comments from the public on the coliving housing.

Eileen Mooney asked what process would be in place for the Town to require a bond from developers who develop properties by-right. How will the Town ensure that projects get done.

Ms. Nelson said the Planning Board will have site plan review over by-right applications. She said conditions will be enforced by the Building Inspector.

Mr. Hankin asked if Mrs. Mooney was referring to a performance bond.

Mrs. Mooney said yes.

Ms. Nelson said she is not sure if this housing would rise to that level. She said the Building Inspector could withhold certificates of occupancy if necessary.

Mr. Rembold said SPR approval is good for one year. The Planning Board has authority under SPR to require conditions that could include a bond or the completion of a certain amount of the project within a specific time or other types of conditions.

Mr. Pachano asked what would be the damage to the public if a developer pulled out of a private project.

Mr. Higa asked Mrs. Mooney if she was worried about some projects being completed and not others.

Mrs. Mooney referred to how long the Searles School project has taken. She suggested that there should have been conditions on that project to ensure it was completed in a certain time.

Mr. Stanley went back to the coliving amendment saying the Thornewood property has other land attached. A special permit will be requested from the Select Board for other uses. Will this amendment prohibit other uses on the property? He said it is good to use the land in the best possible way.

Ms. Nelson said mixed use is a special permit from the Select Board. She suggested checking the definition of mixed use.

Mr. Hankin said mixed use is defined as commercial. He said the Planning Board can grant a deviation by special permit.

Mr. Stanley said he appreciates the Board's deliberation.

Claudia Shapiro, 78 Egremont Plain Road, asked if the discussion is the same as previous Planning Board discussions that include residential use in the Industrial Zone.

Ms. Nelson said mixed use is currently prohibited and multi-use housing could be allowed by special permit.

Ms. Shapiro said the mixed use could be allowed by the Planning Board. She said she is uncomfortable with the Planning Board proposing an amendment that it would be SPGA. She asked if the amendment is to allow housing on the Hazen property that is owned by the Town. She asked if that is the intent of the proposed amendment. (She may have intended to identify the Cook's Garage building behind the Rubin Mill.)

Ms. Nelson said she is unaware of the Hazen property. She said the amendment is not specific to the Hazen property.

Ms. Shapiro asked if the amendment is intended to allow housing at the airport.

Ms. Nelson said the amendment is not pertaining to the airport. She said we are not discussing the airport. It is not being rezoned.

Ms. Shapiro asked if Ms. Nelson could give assurance that the airport would not be rezoned.

Ms. Nelson said it is absolutely not proposed to rezone the airport..

There were no additional comments from the public on the by-right housing. The discussion of tree replacement was opened for discussion. There were no comments. The discussion of the Citizen's petition was opened for public discussion.

Mr. Clark said he is in favor of rezoning the parcels. He said he understands the complexity of the property. He supported more density without allowing commercial uses.

There were no other public comments. Ms. Nelson opened the discussion up to the Planning Board members.

Mr. Hankin commented on the Citizen's Petition saying the petitioner can strike the language in the petition that refers to the deed restriction.

Mr. Rembold said if the Board wants to take on the amendment to make it their own the language can be changed. Otherwise, the language to the ATM must be as currently presented then amended on the Town Meeting floor.

Mr. Clark asked if the Planning Board will provide a recommendation or report to the ATM.

Ms. Nelson said yes.

Mr. Higa asked if in the Table of Use there is a typo where it indicates PB for mixed use in the Industrial zone.

Mr. Rembold said yes.

Ms. Kain asked if it is better for the Planning Board to take over the petition.

Mr. Hankin said it is less contentious for the citizens to present.

Ms. Nelson said we will make a recommendation. We like to do our due diligence when we bring an amendment to the ATM. We haven't been able to do that for this amendment so it should stay with the citizens who have done the vetting.

Michele Loubert, Division Street, asked if the signatures on the citizens' petition were certified as it does not appear that they have been by what is in the packet.

Mr. Rembold said the signatures were certified.

There were no other comments.

Mr. Hankin made a motion to close the public hearing, Mr. Fick seconded, all in favor. The public hearing was closed at 6:53 PM.

Ms. Nelson suggested pivoting to the North Plain Road public hearing then returning to the zoning amendments to deliberate.

Mr. Rembold said the Board need not finish deliberations tonight. Deliberations can take place at the next meeting.

SUBDIVISION: NORTH PLAIN ROAD

Mr. Hankin made a motion to reopen the public hearing for the North Plain Road subdivision, Mr. Fick seconded, all in favor. The public hearing was reopened at 6:54 PM.

Mr. Rembold was present on behalf of the Town. Also present was Brent White from White Engineering, who is the Town's engineer and Fred Clark, from the Great Barrington Affordable Housing Trust.

Present on behalf of Central Berkshire Habitat for Humanity was Carolyn Valli and Attorney Elizabeth Goodman.

Mr. White read through the letter he submitted with revised plans. The letter dated, March 13, 2024, went through the comments and suggestions discussed at the Planning Board meeting on February 29, 2024. He thanked the Board for the discussion at the last meeting the suggestions were helpful in improving the project. He provided the summary of changes which included revising some of the road drainage, pitching the road toward the catch basins, not clearing as much of the land along the boundaries, eliminating the boulder wall, updating how the water lines will be brought into the project, rotating the houses to allow for solar.

Mr. White said the tree list prepared by the Town of Great Barrington was consulted for the tree selections.

Mr. White said all of the lighting will be 3,000k and will be directed to the road not the houses. This is shown on the revised plans.

Mr. White said the road width for the entire road is 18 feet. He said this was not in the cover letter. There will be three stop signs on the road too.

Mr. White thanked the Board for summary of concerns. He said he believes the revised plans reflect the comments from the Board.

Ms. Nelson asked if there were comments from the public.

Jennifer Race, 377 North Plain Road, said she is an abutter. Her property is just south of the proposed driveway. She asked if the tall vegetation along the property line will be staying.

Ms. Nelson said the house sites need to be cleared. She said there will be a buffer setback that will remain along the property line.

Mr. White said the east side of the property will have some clearing but planting will be added. The intention is for north and south side of the property to be maintained with the existing vegetation. He said a silt fence will be installed during construction then removed.

There were no other comments from the public. Ms. Nelson asked the Board for their comments.

Mr. Hankin thanked Mr. White for the work done. He said houses 11-16 were not turned on the plans. He said he appreciated the other houses being turned.

Ms. Nelson asked if what is shown the footprints for where the houses will go.

Mr. Rembold said they are never exactly shown but we agree with the solar benefit.

Ms. Valli said each site will be purchased by people who will want the flexibility to put the right houses on the right sites. We agree with the goal to be solar friendly.

Mr. Hankin said sheet 1 of 1 still identifies the traffic island, even though it has been removed from the plan.

Mr. Rembold said the words are still there.

Mr. Hankin asked why the 20 foot setback is not considered part of the open space calculation. He said it doesn't make any sense to exclude it.

Mr. White said the intention was only to show the road area.

Ms. Hankin said you are not showing the setback as open space and you don't want a walking path but it is still open space. He said he wants the plans to be accurate.

Ms. Nelson said the space is held in common.

Mr. White said the open space is identified per lot. He said it was clarified in the original documents.

Ms. Goodman said the area needs to be shaded in gray.

Ms. Nelson said the area all the way to the boundary needs to be shaded in gray.

Mr. White said he didn't think the shading needed to be beyond the setbacks. He said enough open space has been provided.

Ms. Goodman said there is sufficient open space.

Mr. White agreed. He said there is more than enough open space.

Ms. Goodman said she would look at the regulations to see if open space excludes setbacks.

Mr. White said he hates to see the process delayed by looking at the regulations.

Mr. Hankin said there are lot lines shown around where the houses will go, even though there are no lots being created by a PURD.

Mr. White said he had to show there is enough land.

Ms. Goodman said each home owner will get some exclusive area around the house.

Mr. Hankin said it needs to be explained on the plan. The common area needs to be shown.

Mr. White said the lines are shown to show compliance with the PURD requirements. Mr. Hankin clarified that the PURD open space requirements are derived from the entire number of units being created, not on a per unit basis.

Mr. Rembold said we are working with two sets of regulations at once, the PURD and definitive subdivision plans. There are not 20 lots being created.

Mr. White said we are subdividing out the roadway. The road width will include utilities and the area to allow access to the Town. The easements will be part of the master documents for all utilities to be maintained.

Ms. Nelson said the lot that is being created is the roadway. The rest of the land is where the houses will be built. That area is described for exclusive common area use.

Mr. Rembold said the shaded area is not necessarily the exclusive use area.

Ms. Goodman said she couldn't find where setbacks count as open space.

Ms. Nelson said there are waivers to consider. She said we made it clear last time that we are trying to make a better project.

Ms. Goodman asked if the Board wanted Mr. White to shade the 20 foot setback.

Ms. Nelson said she didn't think it was necessary.

Mr. Hankin said he thinks it is necessary.

Mr. Hankin said he wanted the shoulder to be continuous where the transformer is and on both sides of the entrance road. The shoulder is needed including the wrap around to the loop road. He said the stop sign is needed at the entrance to the loop road. He said he wasn't sure why the other two were needed. He said he can't see where there is any indication that a left turn can be made. He said half the people will want to turn left.

Mr. White said the profile lines are for the cut and fill. The road is a two way road. It is clear that turns can be made to the left or the right.

Mr. Hankin said the two other stop signs aren't needed.

Ms. Nelson suggested it can be up to Mr. White to decide if the other stop signs are needed.

Mr. Hankin said the trees chosen from the Town's tree list are ornamental trees not street trees.
Ms. Nelson said she thought there was some conflicting information from the last meeting.

Mr. Fick asked what will be voted on.

Ms. Nelson said we will vote on the waivers and the definitive subdivision plan.

Mr. Pachano said the road and the waivers.

Mr. Hankin said it is crazy that we can't talk about street trees and street lights.

Mr. Rembold said we can clarify the trees and lights. The guidance is helpful.

Mr. Hankin said we want to create the most pleasant environment but this plan doesn't do that.

Ms. Goodman said there are trees on the list but the list doesn't say the type of tree.

Mr. White said there could be a different recommendation for trees. He said the plan shows one shade tree per house.

Mr. Rembold said trees and the goal of solar are conflicting.

Mr. Hankin said no there isn't a conflict. The street trees will be in the common area. He said he drove by Blue Hill Commons. The common area is similar to what is being proposed. He said no one has used the space since its creation 20 some years ago..

Ms. Goodman said she thought the meetings Ms. Valli had with the potential buyers had indications that the common area would be a playing field.

Ms. Valli said the potential buyers discussed a gazebo in the open space and a place for the kids to play. If they want a tree or trees they should get to choose what they want and where to plant. She said this has worked out well in other projects.

Ms. Nelson said she would like to allow the community to make the decision.

Mr. Hankin said he doesn't want to allow the community to decide because it is our purview and duty to make the project as good as we can.

Mr. Hankin asked Mr. White to correct the plans regarding the storm drains to change where the legend still calls them water pipes.

Mr. Hankin said 20 foot street lights are not great for a residential plan.

Mr. Pachano agreed.

Mr. White said he reached out to the vendor about the street lights. He didn't return the call. He said he addressed the fixture head for the light on the traveled way. He said he didn't get the photometrics for a 15 foot light.

Mr. Hankin said a smaller light pole will have a smaller footprint. You want more.

Mr. White said we showed that the 20 foot light pole wouldn't light people's homes.

Ms. Nelson suggested they can come back if they need to increase the number of poles. She said she is not inclined to kick the plan back. A 15 foot pole should have less than or equal to the light that is shown.

Mr. Hankin said he disagreed. He said sheet 4 of 7 also shows the storm drain as the water supply pipe. He said there are two transformers in the central common area.

Mr. White said there is a third transformer by the pump station. He said the transformers have to go where National Grid wants them.

Mr. Hankin said there are three hydrants around the common area.

Ms. Nelson said the layout is per code.

Mr. White said yes, per the Fire Chief.

Mr. Hankin asked where and how the storm drain manholes are buried? It is not shown on the detail sheet.

Mr. Rembold said he wasn't sure that detail needed to be provided.

Ms. Nelson said they are called out on the plan. We need to rely on the Town to make sure they are built according to the plan.

Mr. Hankin asked how the Town will find them.

Mr. White said they are shown in the plans. They will use a metal detector.

Mr. Hankin said 20 foot light poles are shown on the plan

Ms. Nelson said we can address the light poles in our conditions.

Mr. White said the plans can be changed according to the conditions and comments. The plans can be changed prior to going out to bid.

Mr. Fick said he doesn't think it is our job to come up with the best possible plan.

Mr. Pachano said the project is a subdivision. It qualifies as a PURD. He said he has concerns about the common land. The common land will be deeded exclusive and per the PURD has to remain as common. Does the land remain open space or in a natural state.

Mr. Fick said an exclusive easement will be granted.

Mr. Pachano said he is bringing up reviewing the PURD not the definitive plan.

Mr. Fick said we can ask for a description or make it a condition of approval.

Mr. Pachano said he wants it to comply.

Ms. Nelson said the PURD has already been issued. She said she didn't disagree with the concerns, but the PURD has been granted.

Mr. Pachano said he appreciates the work that Habitat does. He encouraged the Board to work to refine the process. This process contributes to the housing costing more. There is not a lot of land for us to develop in the future.

Ms. Nelson said the difference is the land ownership stays with the Town so people are not bearing the cost of the land making the housing more affordable.

Mr. Pachano said he regrets being on a board that is approving this type of development.

Ms. Nelson said no one is happy that we are only getting 20 units. She said we have to move forward.

Mr. Pachano said he is making the comment because Habitat is in the business of affordability.

Mr. Fick made a motion to close the public hearing, Mr. Pachano seconded. Mr. Fick, Mr. Pachano, Mr. Higa and Ms. Nelson in favor. Mr. Hankin opposed.
The public hearing was closed at 8:57 PM.

Mr. Rembold read the waivers submitted in the original submittal.

- Requirement to provide a schedule of operations until after the bid document is accepted
- Performance guarantees (This is a Town project not a developer who could walk away)
- RDA requirement from the Conservation Commission (Cons Com reviewed and determined they don't have any jurisdiction)
- Flag the center line of the entire road
- Design requirement-Strict compliance with road design standards. (There are no concerns for 50 foot right of ways or sidewalks)
- Requirement for monuments
- Road sign with name (Name has not yet been determined yet, though Ms. Valli said that the prospective buyers voted for Prosperity Way.)
- Street trees on both sides of the road 50 feet apart
- Waive fees

There is no waiver request for street lights. 240-19 B requires high pressure sodium lights. Light are agreed to be LED and 3000k or less.

Mr. Pachano made a motion to approve the waivers as requested, Mr. Higa seconded, discussion.

Mr. Hankin said there are no shoulders in some places.

Mr. Rembold said there are shoulders on the entrance road. He said this can be addressed as a condition.

A condition for an 18 foot wide paved road with two foot shoulders was agreed upon.

Mr. Rembold said a road sign will be located at the intersection with North Plain Road. The waiver was approved and the condition is added for the sign.

Ms. Nelson said we like street trees. There won't be a 50 foot right of way. She said she isn't sure one tree every fifty feet can be maintained.

Mr. Hankin said maybe the right of way for utilities should be wider to accommodate street trees.

Ms. Goodman said street trees could be in the condo agreement to grant an easement for them.

Mr. Rembold said he didn't know if the Town would accept planting and maintenance of trees.

Ms. Nelson said she would like to encourage Habitat to plant trees. She said planting trees could be overwhelming for new home owners.

Mr. Hankin said he would like to let the Town plant the trees. He said he thinks trees should be on both sides of the road.

Mr. Fick asked how many trees are to be required.

Ms. Goodman said generally trees are located on the lots.

Mr. Pachano said you don't have lots.

Ms. Goodman said the trees could be planted on the land owned by the condo association. There could be a condition with a waiver for both sides of the road. There can be an easement for plantings.

Ms. Nelson asked if there could be trees on one side.

Mr. Hankin said no.

Mr. Fick said he is willing to leave it up to the owners.

Mr. Rembold said the Board requested one tree per house.

Mr. Nelson said it would cost about \$300 per tree. She agreed with Mr. Fick. She said she is good with what is on the plan.

Mr. Higa said the open space will look nicer with trees.

Mr. Pachano asked why there is opposition to trees. He asked what he is voting on. He said he doesn't have an opinion. He asked why there is a waiver.

Mr. Rembold said the waiver request is from one tree every 50 feet.

Mr. White added to allow the homeowners choice and not to burden them with cost and maintenance.

Ms. Goodman said the homeowners can choose what to plant and where to plant it.

Ms. Nelson asked the Board if they want to give the homeowners a choice or hold the development to 1 tree every 50 feet that will mean 48 trees will be planted. Currently there are 20 trees on the plan.

Mr. Pachano said if trees are what they want for their project it's fine. It is up to them. He said he just wants to know why they wouldn't want trees.

Ms. Goodman said we want flexibility in the number of trees.

Mr. Pachano said if you are willing to plant why not just plant.

Ms. Valli said she worked with the State on another project. The homeowners were able to pick out what they wanted and where to put them. The homeowners will learn about budgeting and maintenance. She said she we are not opposed to trees we just wanted the flexibility of where to put them. She said there is a cost factor.

Ms. Nelson said there are 20 trees shown on the house side of the road. Maybe in the next 5 years another 28 can be planted per the choice of the homeowners.

Mr. Hankin said it should be specified that trees will be planted along both sides of the road.

Ms. Nelson said 20 trees could be planted now and an additional 28 trees could be planted in the future. This might be a possible solution.

The Board discussed conditions for shoulders on both side of the entrance road, an 18 foot road width for the loop road, a stop sign at the intersection with North Plain Road and the name of the road and road sign will be provided at a future time.

Mr. Fick made a motion to amend the original motion to remove the waiver request for 240-15, street signs, Mr. Higa seconded, all in favor.

The Board discussed trees again suggesting to require 20 trees now and 28 in the future. Mr. Pachano said if the trees are a burden on the project we don't want to require them.

Ms. Nelson said we are trying to be flexible.

Mr. Fick agreed.

Ms. Nelson called for a vote on the motion to approve the waivers.
All in favor, Mr. Hankin abstain.

The Board continued discussion for the definitive subdivision plan with conditions that include shoulders on both side of the entrance road, an 18 foot paved road width for the loop road with 2 foot shoulders on both sides, a stop sign at the intersection with North Plain Road, the name of the road and road sign will be provided at a future time, 20 large street trees will be planted now with the remaining 28 street trees to be waived or planted in the future, 15 foot light poles with LED lights 3000k or less.

Mr. Pachano said he would like the applicant to say the trees are a significant cost burden to the project.

Mr. Rembold said he didn't think we can say the trees are cost prohibitive. He said he couldn't give a definitive answer.

Mr. Hankin asked why the trees couldn't be paid for with part of the \$3.2 million grant.

Ms. Valli said we will go over that \$3.2 million. There won't be any money left over so we need to prioritize the infrastructure.

Mr. Rembold said if necessary the applicant can come back to revise the conditions. A revision will require a full public hearing process.

Ms. Nelson said it doesn't have to be stated that the applicant can come back to revise the plan.

Mr. Fick made a motion to grant definitive subdivision approval with the conditions as discussed, Mr. Higa seconded, all in favor.

Ms. Nelson said she would like to table the zoning discussion until the next meeting on March 28. The Board agreed.

TOWN PLANNER'S REPORT:

Mr. Rembold said Barrington Brook will be coming back to the Board with an update on the development and a request to release lots so they can get certificates of occupancy.

BOARD & COMMITTEE UPDATES/ISSUES & CONCERNS

Mr. Pachano said BRPC will have a 5th Thursday meeting in May. The topic will be Micro Transit.

Mr. Higa said he would like to have a future agenda item for a joint meeting with the Housing Sub Committee.

Ms. Kain reminded the Board that the Master Plan assignments are past due. She said she will set another deadline. She asked everyone to get reports to her as soon as possible.

Ms. Nelson said the Lake Mansfield construction is ongoing. She said construction on the road will begin on March 18th.

Mr. Rembold said the road construction might be pushed back a few days but construction will start soon.

CITIZEN'S SPEAK TIME:

No one spoke

Having concluded its business, Ms. Nelson adjourned without objection at 8:54 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Kimberly L. Shaw

Kimberly L. Shaw
Planning Board Secretary