

SCITUATE PLANNING BOARD MINUTES June 25, 2020

Members Present: Ann Burbine, Chairman; Stephen Pritchard, Vice Chairman; Patricia Lambert, Clerk; Benjamin Bornstein and Rebecca Lewis. The alternate seat was vacant.

Others Present: Karen Joseph, Town Planner; Shari Young, Planning Administrative Assistant.

Members absent: None.

See Sign-in List for names of others present at this meeting; no sign in list meeting held remotely.

Location of meeting: Selectmen's Hearing Room, Town Hall, 600 C J Cushing Highway, Scituate.

Chairman Burbine called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. The meeting was conducted in compliance with the Governor's executive order modifying the Open Meeting Law regulations for remote participation during the COVID-19 health pandemic. The meeting was being recorded for airing on local cable television.

Documents

- 6/25/20 Planning Board Agenda

ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA: Chairman Burbine indicated there was a posted agenda. Ms. Lambert seconded the motion for the posted agenda and the vote was unanimously in favor.

Roll Call to call the meeting to order:

A roll call vote was taken to open the meeting.

Ms. Burbine - yes
Mr. Pritchard – yes
Ms. Lambert – yes
Mr. Bornstein - yes
Ms. Lewis – yes

**Continued - Public Hearing – Stormwater and Site Plan Administrative Review Common Driveway - 16, 18-20 Mann Hill Road
Assessor's Map/Block/Lot 27-7-9
Applicant/Owner: Estate of Patsy Jo Terrell**

Documents

- PDF 3804 Cvr Ltr 6-3-20
- PDF 3804 SWP 5-19-20
- PDF 19288 – PB Review Report, #18, 18 and 20 Mann Hill Road, 6-05-20
- DOC Draft Motion

Virtual Attendees: Greg Tansey, Ross Engineering Co., Inc.

Mr. Tansey indicated there have been several rounds of review with the Town's Consulting Engineer, Peter Palmieri, Merrill Consulting regarding this project. He said they have satisfied all the technical element comments from review, but feels there is one point on which the Board should opine on in terms of the Stormwater Management System. The Town's consultant has requested the system be in an easement, but the system consists of very subtle grading in the rear yard area and some subsurface infiltrators that have drains at low points in the lawn that go directly into chambers, the chambers are accessible through the drain. The drain also serves as an inspection point and can be evacuated through pneumatic processes that could be done quickly and relatively inexpensively. The applicant is opposed to an easement in someone's backyard; it would preclude the owner from utilizing the yard area, devalues the lot and brings up questions as to whom you grant the easement to, the homeowner's would be the only ones to maintain these systems. He said he designed the system so they are integral that the homeowner would maintain the lawns and landscaping. He opined if there was a detention basin in the back it would not be maintained; homeowner's are going to maintain their lawns and landscaping and the structures will be maintained. He said they look at the same things with a septic system that is much more elaborate then this stormwater management system and there is no reason to put a septic system in an easement. He suggested the Board put something in the chain of title as a means of control that would allow the Planning Board, Town or DPW to take some action to remedy a situation should it go aria; they do not anticipate any issues and said there are many of these systems in town and does not know of any problems. He opined the easement is the major outstanding comment and it is a call for the Planning Board. He said it could be conditioned and recorded with language that a homeowner would not alter the rear yard area and area where the stormwater management system is. He also noted that the Town's Consultant asked for another detention basin at the back of lot #1, it was added because the consultant requested that freeboard be used in the structures for the 100 year storm.

Ms. Joseph asked Mr. Tansey to clarify which house numbers go with which lots on the plans; 16 is Lot 3, 20 is Lot 1. Mr. Tansey indicated in the back of #16 a detention basin was added so that a foot of free board could be provided. He said the detention basin allows the performance standards of the stormwater bylaw to be met. He indicated the water that goes into the basin is mostly coming from off site; there is an up gradient area that goes through the site and discharges off the site to the north, they capture the water up high, mitigate it and release it so there would be less flow going through the undisturbed buffer and off the northern property line much like it does now; he said they have met the performance standards of the bylaw. He said the standards were met with their previous iteration without the basin, but the other basin would be almost full to the top without a foot of free board, per the request, so they had to add the extra basin.

Ms. Joseph asked Mr. Tansey to give a brief description of what has changed on the plan indicating this is the second public hearing for this project, she indicated that there has been a total redesign.

Mr. Tansey indicated the changes to the plan:

- Addition of the detention basin in back of house #16, Lot #3
- Addition of an easement on the northern property line for a drain line coming out of detention basin 1.
 - Detention basin 1 is located near the beginning of the common driveway, basin is north of the driveway
- Some regrading of basin 1
- Increased size of drain line coming out of basin 1
- Shall swale in front of proposed dwelling #18, Lot 2

- Subtle regarding of basin on Lot 2

Mr. Tansey explained what “freeboard” means; in the 100 yrs. storm the maximum height in the basin is a foot below the very top rim of the basin, the 1’ vertical distance is referred to as “freeboard”.

Ms. Joseph added that they have also taken out soil amendments and have created a buffer in the back and there is a 1:1 riprap slope along the back of Lot 2 and Lot 1. There is now a vegetated buffer, the site will no longer be clear cut. Mr. Tansey indicated that they are not extending any grading out to the property lines on Lot 2 and Lot 1, but there will be detention basin on Lot 3. He said the vegetated wood line would remain. He also said there are a few large trees near the rear property line of the site the abutters wanted to keep and they will be keeping those trees and the area between the sloped riprap and stonewall will remain undisturbed.

Ms. Joseph asked why an easement could not be done and indicated that at the last meeting Mr. Bornstein mentioned some landscape features that could be added that would be an asset to the properties; why is a 1:1 riprap slope in the middle of the back yard an asset. Mr. Tansey indicated it is a stabilized slope and will give a larger buffer area in the back yard that is the intent. He said it also helps to raise the grade and looks better looking through the buffer; it provides a better screen. Ms. Joseph recommended to the Board that they strongly consider an easement because that is what has been required with other projects. She also asked the applicant to explain how these driveways are going to have sight line visibility. Mr. Tansey indicated if the project is approved they would survey the property at the edge of the road and remove anything that needs to be maintained for the site distance; he opined there should not be any issue with removing vegetation and providing site lines. There is no Homeowner’s Association, but there is an Operation and Maintenance Plan that the homeowner’s would be responsible for. There was discussion that it should be part of the deed and there should also be conditions that the Homeowner’s are responsible for keeping the site lines clear. It was discussed that there should be area for clearing for the site lines shown on the plans.

Ms. Joseph indicated that this is a total redesign and feels there should be an easement. Mr. Pritchard said he agrees.

Mr. Pritchard indicated there is a 4” surface drain and asked how it is intended to function; does the runoff go into the surface drain. Mr. Tansey explained the system; there is a very shallow hole along the backyard, a long rectangular skinny hole that will look like lawn area, it is a little over one foot deep, when that fills up it will then go down the drain to subsurface chambers and will then start infiltrating. Mr. Tansey said this will also serve as inspection ports and if it needs to be cleaned it can be extracted through pneumatic means easily. Mr. Pritchard pointed out it is 4” in diameter and has a cover. Mr. Tansey indicated it is a grate that allows water to pass through into the chambers below. Mr. Pritchard opined that has potential to clog up very quickly and the alternative is it will spill over its banks. Mr. Tansey said there is a lot of infiltration going on in the bottom of it and a lot of the water will get into the subsurface chambers via infiltration. He said they would be submerged, under a head and if the Board wanted a 6” diameter grate he is not opposed to it, but he opined these things have worked quite well and he has not had complaints about functionality.

Ms. Joseph indicated that the Town’s Consulting Engineer opined the design was okay and had questions about the easement and the site distance. Mr. Pritchard continued to have concerns over the laundering and Mr. Tansey said they could add a few more inspection ports, they could put 2 more in if that makes the Board more comfortable with the system. Mr. Pritchard said he would be

more comfortable with having more inlets to the drain than just one 4" grate that in fall would likely be covered with leaves. Mr. Tansey said he would add 2 more to the plan. The Board is going to ask their Consultant to provide additional comment on the grate and the addition of grates. The applicant is to provide additional funds for peer review.

Mr. Bornstein asked why the design Best Management Practices (BMP's) and stormwater infrastructure are pushed back to the far periphery of the property; why couldn't there be a more decentralized stormwater system away from abutting properties; what assurances can the applicant provide that there won't be any issues to abutters whether it is through the system itself or through potential groundwater breakout after infiltration. Mr. Tansey said he would classify this as a decentralized system; there is a basin out front and another in the back yard, but it is not at the radii of the property and it is the largest, there is another one tucked away in the southeast corner of the site. That basin is handling water from off site; it will mitigate it and discharge it down to the undisturbed buffer strip, the contours are graded to the north and are perpendicular with the property line, water will sheet flow to the north, it will not be going to the abutters to the east. He anticipates the vegetative buffer will thicken and will have a lot of uptake and recharge and the discharge is going to the north. He said that will help mitigate surface discharges, but will also help to absorb some of the ground water; the soil is till and ground water is about 37"- 35" down, some was at 44", 49" and 37" that is the typical till. He said the stormwater controls have mitigated peak flow rate and volumes. He said it is a decentralized system, there is permeable pavement which is an excellent BMP, and it doesn't produce runoff and provides a very good decentralized way of recharging stormwater runoff throughout the site. He opined they have the best system here in terms of stormwater basins and BMPs.

Mr. Bornstein asked if the basins proposed are to be seeded and mowed. Mr. Tansey said the turf in the basins would be a basic seed mix and the intent is the basins would be mowed with a lawn mower and would look like lawn. Mr. Bornstein asked with the concerns of the abutters about the design and the clearing, etc. why not have the basins be bio-retention basins that could be planted with vegetation to provide more screening and mitigate the impacts of habitat loss and environmental service loss from the clearing. Mr. Tansey indicated that it is all clean runoff going into them and said that bio-retention cells are usually used to provide treatment of stormwater that has been contaminated by roadway surfaces; these structures are just receiving roof water runoff. He said it is not necessary and is not really providing any more protection from stormwater. Mr. Bornstein said that his comment was not in relation to stormwater; it is about screening and mitigating the habitat loss and the reduction of environmental and ecological ecosystem services from clearing, not about stormwater. Mr. Bornstein opined that it would be beneficial to the abutters that a landscape plan with plantings be involved with the basins instead of just a depression that is mowed and serves no purpose; augmenting the screening, mitigating the impacts of clearing and lot development through a planting plan would establish some benefits and would be better than just the grass. Mr. Bornstein said they will agree to disagree.

Ms. Joseph asked where the rooftop runoff is going and how is it getting to the basins. Mr. Tansey indicated all discharge from tributary areas is getting into the basin on Lot 2 by overland sheet flow. The basins are usable lawn areas and will look very nice; the homeowner will appreciate it and there will place for kids to play. Mr. Tansey said he understands what the Board is saying, he favors vegetation, but they have provided a lot more vegetation with the buffer, which they did not have the first time; originally there was lawn all the way up to the stonewall, they have redesigned the whole system and provided a vegetative buffer and have provided a nice lawn area for the project which provides a very effective means of storm water control.

Mr. Bornstein asked about the operation and maintenance plan and the infiltration capacity of the proposed permeable pavement, porous asphalt. Mr. Tansey indicated the porous asphalt is maintained much like regular pavement, it needs to be shoveled and plowed, but it does not need salt or sanding on the surface; it is a coarser surface pavement, it is not like standard pavement that becomes slick when there is snow, water and slush infiltrate through the pavement so there is no sanding and salting required, the DEP credits this BMP with giving an 80% TSS removal rate, which is the highest it could be without a proprietary structure.

Ms. Lambert commented that these systems force homeowner's to become stormwater engineers. She said lives in place where she has to control all this and it is very hard for the average person to comprehend, i.e. when it needs to be looked at, how to maintain it, etc. She agrees with Mr. Bornstein and said this Board does not like clear-cutting. She opined it should be kept as natural as possible and that a 4" pipe in a backyard is an accident waiting to happen.

Ms. Lewis asked if the trees the abutters wanted to keep are in the buffer zone. Mr. Tansey indicated they are just inside the buffer zone, right along the property line, right near the stone wall. He said the buffer zone will remain as is behind lots 2 and 3. Mr. Pritchard asked for some dimensions on the buffer zone, to make sure it is marked so it is clear as to what needs to remain. Mr. Tansey said they can stake it out in the field. The Board wants dimensions.

Public Comment:

Ms. Shari Wasserman resident at 12 Mann Hill Road, asked about the pipe infiltration trench on the border of lot 3 and her property; how close is it to the property line, where does it drain off, front to back and does it drain into the newly created basin #3, how close is the edge of the house to the property line and she commented that it seems woods are being given up for a mosquito lake(basin #3) and why does it appear the leaching area for the septic system for lot #3 is so much smaller than those for lots 1 and 2. She also agrees that an easement put on a deed will do better job of making sure the homeowners do their job of maintaining the system. Mr. Tansey indicated along the property line is an infiltration trench that will take water coming from the north, the Wasserman property, and infiltrate it and send it into the basin #3; it will take any runoff flowing to the north treat it and send it down to the buffer strip. The intention is not to have any standing water. It is running parallel with the Wasserman's property line; Ms. Wasserman is concerned about a large maple tree that is at the border of the property when the trench is dug; the trench is about 2'-3' from the property line and is about 18" deep. Mr. Tansey said they do not want to cut roots, if they need to cut around the root ball they will do that. Mr. Tansey indicated the septic system on lot 3 is greatly smaller because there were much better perk rates than lot 1 and 2. He also said the property line setback in the area is about 15' and said the house is probably about 16' off the property line, but could not confirm.

Ms. Kristen and Mr. Todd Kichefski residents at 30 Mann Hill Road said she appreciates all the comments they have heard and that there is now a buffer zone, but it is really only across the back line and does not really help with any of the vegetation along their property line the north border; she asked if there was any way to save some of the vegetation along her property and asked about the comment from the review about an easement and a swale and how they would be affected with changes to the stonewall. Mr. Tansey indicated a swale is a shallow ditch that is loamed and seeded it is located just on the other side of the stonewall runoff coming off the grading will be captured by the swale it will run along the property line with a shallow plunge pool a level spreader and then will

sheet flow off in its natural fashion to the north; this was put into an easement. He also indicated that the Town's Consulting Engineer asked for there to be some more cover so they have buried the system a little deeper and have satisfied all the comments. This will provide a little more protection to the Kichefski's property. Mr. Tansey indicated this will not disturb the wall. Mr. Tansey indicated there would not be any other vegetation saved abutting their property; the grading goes right to the stone wall so the vegetation will be removed; the buffer is the only vegetation saved.

There was discussion about the barn. Mr. Tansey indicated it would depend on the property owner; it could be removed, moved or remain in place. The stormwater is based on the current location; he said if it was to be moved to the rear it would not affect the calculations so long as the barn stays in the same watershed it should not affect the calculations. He said if it were moved it is easy to redo the calculations and the Town's Consultant could verify them.

Ms. Marla and Mr. Rich Minier resident at 29 Christopher Lane asked what happens once the developer has left, who is really responsible for cleaning out the drainage and what happens if it is not maintained. Mr. Tansey said the homeowner's are responsible and if it is not maintained it will look unsightly and the homeowner's would have to live with any inconvenience of the lack of maintenance. Mr. Tansey said the maintenance of these control systems is very much integral with the maintenance of the yard area and most homeowner's will keep their lawn in good shape; these systems have a good record of longevity and functionality.

Ms. Burbine said she disagrees with Mr. Tansey and provided an example where a homeowner had put in a garden on top of a swale. She said it might be unsightly to the people who will own the home, but is it also unsightly to the neighbors and that is the point of this. She said people will have no idea what to do, it will depend upon their landscaper who may or may not dump all the grass into the swale.

Ms. Minier also asked what would prevent a homeowner from clearing the undergrowth that is anticipated to grow on the buffer and what would prevent a future homeowner from replacing it with typical asphalt. Mr. Tansey said he has never had happen; the pavement is good for thirty years or more there is no real practical reason why a homeowner would want to replace it, it would be very difficult; there are only 2 driveways, one is a common driveway and replace that asphalt both neighbors would have to be in agreement to do it and violate their permit. Ms. Burbine said with regards to the buffer strip the Board will put a condition on this special permit that is someone removes it they will be responsible for replicating it or they will fined; the Board imposed this condition on the last special permit they granted. The Board is doing whatever they can to ensure what is on the plan is what is followed and there will be repercussions if people chose to not do what they are supposed to do.

Ms. Burbine opined it is too much on too small a space, 3 big houses on 2 acres of land, everything is being smooshed in; it might meet the conditions, but she has a real problem with it. She indicated the meeting will need to be continued.

Ms. Joseph said we will need more money from the applicant and at the next hearing it should be discussed how the project is going to be constructed. The Board does not want the basins used as sedimentation sumps during construction.

Mr. Pritchard requested the O&M plan. Ms. Joseph will send that and a detailed SWPPP plan.

Motion:

Ms. Lambert moved to accept the applicant's request to continue the public hearing for the Stormwater Permit and Common Driveway Site Plan Administrative Review for 16, 18 and 20 until August 13, 2020 at 7:00 pm and to continue the time for action for filing with the Town Clerk until September 30, 2020.

Mr. Bornstein seconded the motion; the vote was unanimously in favor.

Ms. Burbine - yes
Mr. Pritchard – yes
Ms. Lambert – yes
Mr. Bornstein - yes
Ms. Lewis – yes

Informal Discussion – 126 First Parish Road – Gulf Station Canopy

Documents

- PDF Renderings

Virtual Attendees: Shawn Harris and Phil James

Mr. James indicated that the Gulf Oil Company is proposing to put in a canopy that will just go over the pumps of the current station; it will not attach to the building and will be approximately 5'-8' away from the walkway on the road along First Parish Road. The canopy is mainly for the employees to protect them from rain, snow, etc.

There was discussion about fire suppression; Mr. James said it was not necessary because it if full serve, if it was self-serve fire suppression would be needed.

Ms. Joseph indicated that she and Ms. Burbine discussed this matter with Mr. Vogel, Building Commissioner and Zoning Enforcement Officer and Mr. Duggan Assistant Building and Zoning Enforcement Officer, and it was determined that this is a pre-existing non-conforming use and the first round of approval for this would be through the ZBA; it was approved with special permits for a pre-existing non-conforming use and that is under ZBA jurisdiction. Ms. Joseph indicated that Mr. Harris should speak with the Building Department because he is adding a structure.

Mr. Harris said this has been around for 70 years and this will on improve the area.

Ms. Joseph indicated that because it was likely approved under a ZBA decision years ago for a pre-existing non-conforming use and the project is to add a structure to an already pre-existing non-conforming use it will have to go to the ZBA.

Mr. Pritchard asked if they are adding something that is making it more non-conforming; yes, they are adding a structure, the canopy. He asked what non-conformity that the canopy is adding to. Ms.

Joseph indicated the canopy is a structure and would be closer to the roadway; this is the advice of the Building and Zoning Officer.

There was confusion as to what the increase in the non-conformity was. It was suggested that Mr. Harris have a conversation with Mr. Vogel and Mr. Duggan to lay out what he plans to do so they can make a determination of the next steps

Board Re-organization and signatures

Ms. Lambert nominated Ms. Burbine as Chair and nominated Mr. Bornstein as Vice Chair.

Ms. Lewis seconded the motion; the vote was unanimously in favor.

Ms. Burbine - yes
Mr. Pritchard – yes
Ms. Lambert – yes
Mr. Bornstein - yes
Ms. Lewis – yes

Ms. Burbine nominated Ms. Lambert to continue as Clerk.

Mr. Bornstein seconded the motion; the vote was unanimously in favor.

Ms. Burbine - yes
Mr. Pritchard – yes
Ms. Lambert – yes
Mr. Bornstein - yes
Ms. Lewis – yes

Documents

- Liaison List

The Board discussed and assigned new liaisons for the upcoming year.

Ms. Burbine - Traffic Rules and Regs	Ms. Lewis – Commission on Disabilities
Mr. Bornstein – EDC	Ms. Lewis – Shellfish
Ms. Lambert – Street Acceptance	Ms. Lambert - Public Buildings

The Board decided to wait on South Shore Coalition liaison.

Mr. Pritchard remained as the Liaison for the Advisory Committee

Motion:

Ms. Lambert moved to declare the Alternate Planning Board member position vacant and to request the Board of Selectmen and Planning Board jointly appoint a new Alternate Planning Board member and prepare to post the position in the Scituate Mariner and post on the Town's website and social media platforms through the months of July and August.

Mr. Bornstein seconded the motion; the vote was unanimously in favor.

Ms. Burbine - yes
Mr. Pritchard – yes
Ms. Lambert – yes
Mr. Bornstein - yes
Ms. Lewis – yes

Minutes
Documents

- Meeting minutes 6.11.20

Ms. Lambert moved to approve the meeting minutes for June 11, 2020.

Mr. Bornstein seconded the motion; a roll call vote was taken and was unanimously in favor.

Ms. Burbine - yes
Mr. Pritchard – yes
Ms. Lambert – yes
Mr. Bornstein – yes
Ms. Lewis - yes

Accounting
Documents

PO #2010246 (\$412.50), PO #2010247 (\$360.00), PO #2000510(\$1,142.50), PO #2010099 (\$197.50)

Ms. Lambert moved to approve the requisition of \$412.50 to Merrill Corporation for peer review of 16, 18-20 Mann Hill Road Stormwater/SPAR Common Driveway, for \$360.00 to Merrill Corporation for peer review of Stormwater at 273 First Parish Road, for \$1,142.50 to Harriman Associated for consulting services on the Master Plan, for \$197.50 to Chessia Consulting Services, LLC for peer review of Residential Compound Development - Country Way.

Ms. Lewis seconded the motion; a roll call vote was taken and was unanimously in favor.

Ms. Burbine - yes
Mr. Pritchard – yes
Ms. Lambert – yes
Mr. Bornstein – yes
Ms. Lewis - yes

Liaison Reports:

Planning and Development – reported by Ms. Joseph:

- Town meeting on Saturday

- Special Permits in July and August, will not have any decisions on first public hearings
- Toll Brothers remains under construction
- Curtis Estates under construction
- Conference call with Drew Company, hope to start construction in the Fall
- Well 17A has started

There was discussion about the water study and where it stands. Mr. Pritchard has not seen answers or documents from previous discussions and action items that were to be published.

Ms. Joseph indicated the Planning Board has received a couple of emails regarding water and new development. Ms. Burbine said water issues rest with the Water and Sewer Commissioners who are the Board of Selectmen. Mr. Pritchard said that he disagrees with Ms. Burbine's comment; the Board is making decisions on long-term development and planning, it is the Board's responsibility as well. The discussion continued about the role of the Planning Board and how it makes decision based on water with regards to development. Mr. Pritchard said the water study was supposed to address some of these issues and provide a methodology for which the Board could use to guide decision making to apply across all developments. Mr. Bornstein opined the town is at a tipping point and we are now starting to see impacts on everyday citizens quality of life in the activities that are now restricted on their own property and from an economic development perspective as an owner of a small landscape/horticultural business being adversely affected working in the town of Scituate due projects that are postponed or canceled this early in the season; allowing further development to occur is the cart going to over the bus. Ms. Joseph chimed in and said the Master Plan should be helping with strategies for development; the town should be talking about increasing lot sizes. Mr. Pritchard said he worried about the long term availability of the water supply system; every time we make another connection it is harder and harder. He said we were supposed to get the answers to that in the water study with some kind of science-based methodology. The question for the next development that comes in will be do we have the capacity; do we have the capacity in the ground with all the other uses that are in the town. He thinks that is the piece that is missing.

The Board would like the results/recommendations from the study that was done and would then like to have the Water Department and the Head of DPW come in and discuss the findings with them.

Ms. Lambert said that we can't keep promising something that we have no idea if it can be delivered on; that is why people are blaming the Planning Board for the lack of water.

Mr. Pritchard opined the Board has planning responsibility, they cannot control the Water Department, but the Board can have a systematic way and a methodology and procedure that hopefully reflects the reality and can assist in making decisions.

The Board is looking for the results of the study and part of the scope of the study was to provide the methodology; this goes back to October.

Documents

- Email to the Board from Shari Young dated 6.22.20 with agenda for 6.25.20
- Email to the Board from Shari Young dated 6.23.20 with meeting minutes from 6.11.20

- Email to the Board for Karen Joseph dated 6.23.20 with meeting materials for 16, 18-20 Mann Hill Road, 126 First Parish Road - Gulf Station and materials for re-organization of the Board post 2020 elections

These items were distributed to the Board electronically.

Mr. Pritchard moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:00 p.m. Ms. Lambert seconded the motion; the vote was unanimously in favor.

Ms. Burbine - yes

Mr. Pritchard – yes

Ms. Lambert – yes

Mr. Bornstein – yes

Ms. Lewis -yes

Respectfully submitted,

Shari Young

Planning Board Administrative Assistant

Patricia A. Lambert, Clerk

Date Approved: July 23, 2020

