

SCITUATE PLANNING BOARD MINUTES December 1, 2016

Members Present: Stephen Pritchard, Chairman; William Limbacher, Vice Chairman; Ann Burbine, Clerk, Richard Taylor and Alternate member, Gerard Wynne.

Others Present: Ms. Laura Harbottle, Town Planner.

Others Absent: None.

See Sign-in List for names of others present at this meeting.

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

Chairman Pritchard called the meeting to order at 7:30 P.M. The meeting was being recorded for airing on local cable television.

Documents

- 12/1/16 Planning Board Agenda

ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA: Ms. Burbine moved to accept the agenda. Mr. Taylor seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in favor.

Public Hearing – Mixed Use Special Permit in the Village Business Overlay District

4 Union Street

Assessor's Map/Block/Lot 53-4-9

Applicant/Owner: Milton J. Hallin/4 Union Street, LLC

Documents

- Letter, application and deed for Mixed use Development Special Permit
- Preliminary Floor Plan and Elevation for proposed apartment and retail shop building by Anthony P D'Onofrio, AIA dated 6/28/16
- Mixed Use Development Erosion Control Plan for 4 Union Street Scituate, MA dated 9/22/16 with revisions through 11/22/16 by Ross Engineering
- Proposed Site Plan for 4 Union Street Scituate, MA dated 9/22/16 with revisions through 11/22/16 Sheets 1-4 Cover, Existing Conditions, Mixed Use Development Site Plan, Mixed Use Development Stormwater Plan by Ross Engineering
- Land Alteration and Stormwater Management Plan and Report and Stormwater Permit Application for Administrative Review for low impact projects for a mixed use project at 4 Union Street Scituate, MA dated 10/12/16 by Ross Engineering with revisions dated 11/22/16
- Compiled plan of 4 Union Street and 5 and 6 Old Country Way
- Transmittal to departments dated 10/26/16
- Memo from the Design Review Committee dated 11/1/16
- Memo from Health Agent Jennifer Keefe dated 11/9/16
- Email from Deputy Fire Chief Alfred Elliot dated 11/9/16
- Engineering peer review letter by Merrill Associates dated 11/14/16
- Email from Karen Joseph to the Board dated 11/30/16 with Revised Site Plan dated 11/30/16 and comments from the Fire Dept., Board of Health and Design Review Committee
- Email from Laura Harbottle to the Board dated 11/30/16 with above information

John Hallin and Paul Mirabito were present for the applicant. Mr. Mirabito said the locus is adjacent to the proposed microbrewery. He indicated there is an existing commercial building on site with apartments above with eight parking spaces in front which was previously permitted. He said the proposal is for a 20' x 40' mixed use building that will look like a two story cape house. Mr. Mirabito indicated that there are two existing gravel parking spaces and they propose to add five more to the existing paved parking area by striping. He said that the building has two sets of infiltrators for stormwater control and a "Y" connection is proposed off the existing sewer line on site. He said water will be via a 2" line. Mr. Mirabito said the lot is 20,206 sq. ft. and that they have requested a waiver to provide a landscape plan as typical house landscaping will be provided. He indicated the mailboxes will be moved around the corner. He said comments were received from the Board of Health, Fire Department and DPW Engineering who they spoke with today. He said that the Title V flows will be small and are approximately 420 gal /day per calculation but will actually be 75% of that. He said there is little grade change on site and that the Design Review Committee has reviewed the building and they have made a few changes in response to their concerns. He clarified that the entrances to the apartments will be in the rear.

Ms. Harbottle commented that the Board has received comments including a comment from Merrill Engineers that the stormwater system is acceptable; one from the Design Review Committee that they wanted the building to look residential; one from the Fire Department that sprinklers are required in a mixed use building and that the DPW wants the calculated flows for both water and sewer. She said the site is an unusual shape with a lot of space in the back. She indicated that the front setback of 5.5' does not meet the required 10' minimum. She said it is tough to fit a new mixed use building on the site and the apartments are small so they would be suitable for one person. She said the building might contribute to the village atmosphere, but the site is just too tight. She said there are no major problems.

Peter Palmieri of Merrill Engineers said he reviewed the plans for compliance with the Stormwater Permit and the calculations for the 10 and 100 year storm indicate no increase in runoff. He indicated he suggested that the erosion control be expanded and the location of the mail box changed. He said the runoff is a little less and it is all infiltrated including the 100 year storm and soils were done for the new work. Mr. Palmieri indicated he did not look at the existing site to see that it worked, but looked at the net change. Mr. Mirabito said that there is infiltration for the existing building and calculations were done at that time. He said that water for the new building will not flow to the street. Chairman Pritchard asked if the direction of runoff is changing due to the location of the proposed building near the street and if there are spot areas that will see an increase in the flow to the street. Mr. Mirabito said the site contains sandy soil there is less impact to the street. He said the bylaw indicates that the setback is a minimum of 5 feet on Country Way and they have provided 5.5'.

Ms. Burbine indicated she was a proponent of mixed use; but, has a real problem with the proposal. She indicated that page 75 of the zoning bylaw indicates the 5 foot setback for Country Way and Driftway – not Old Country Way. She said the setback should be 10 feet. She said the lot is too small and the use is too big and intense for the location. She said the rear setback of 147' is disingenuous. She questioned sight distance and public safety at the corner of Old Country Way and Union Street. She said moving the mailboxes impedes sight distance and does not support the project. She said if the existing building was to have an addition that would be different. Mr. Limbacher said Ms. Burbine's position was well defined. He asked about access for the business and residential components. Mr. Mirabito said there would be three separate brick walks in front

and parking could either be in the front or back. He said five spaces are required and seven are provided. Mr. Hallin said there are two accesses for the business in front and one for the residences. Mr. Limbacher asked if the apartments had assigned spaces which was positively confirmed. He concurred with Ms. Burbine that the use was too intensive for the corner. He said he may be able to live with the use if it were on the straight portion of the road.

Mr. Taylor said the setback of the brewery will be about 10 feet and would like to see consistency in front by moving the proposed building back to create a street wall. He said he was concerned with sight distance as one cannot see around the corner now due to the shrubs. Ms. Burbine commented that it is an overuse of the property and adding a second building 35 feet high doesn't make sense and doesn't meet zoning. Mr. Taylor said he agreed with Ms. Burbine and Mr. Limbacher that there was no way to put the building as proposed. He said he is also an advocate of mixed use, but this is shoe horned in. He said there is no sidewalk to the front of the building if one parks in the rear. Mr. Hallin said there is an existing walk that goes to the side of the building and part of the one in front is on his property. Mr. Taylor indicated he liked the dormers and clapboards of the proposed building as it was continuing the dormer theme of 50 Country Way. Mr. Wynne said that the proposed structure is being shoe horned in and he agrees with Ms. Burbine that it is too much for the property.

Chairman Pritchard asked what dictated where the building was to be located. Mr. Mirabito indicated there was room in front and that determined where the commercial building was to go and its size. He said he is hearing that the main objection is the setback. Ms. Burbine said it is more than that. He said that this zoning district allows 16 units per acre of housing and eight units could be added. He said the two buildings look better than one big building. He indicated that the street passes over private property and it would be possible to move the building over and remove the gravel parking spaces. Mr. Mirabito said that the mailboxes will be relocated to provide for a curve in the sidewalk. Mr. Taylor asked about the curve of the street. Mr. Mirabito indicated that the street is on the property. He said he does not know why the street can't be changed and then suggested a 90 degree intersection. Chairman Pritchard inquired about the parking. Mr. Mirabito said 7 spaces are required and there are 8 for the existing building for 15 total. He said there is not a problem with overflow parking as some cars can park in the building. Ms. Harbottle said that there is talk of a sizable residential development at the old Fitts Mill site and the Board needs to be careful about changing the geometry of the intersection. She said it is his land, but, people are driving over it. Mr. Hallin said he made accommodations for the mailbox with pavement at the corner.

Steven Monteiro of 9 Jenkins Place said he is the third generation of his family to grow up in this neighborhood. He said he agrees with Ms. Burbine and Mr. Wynne that the site is too tight and doesn't see where the green space is located. He said there are two apartments and there are always two cars in the gravel parking spots and one car is usually parked on the grass. He indicated that it is dangerous now going to Fitts Mill and all of the parking spaces are taken up now and trucks are usually present. Mr. Monteiro said that people don't stop at the stop sign and is concerned because of the number of children in the neighborhood. He said the proposed building is nice looking; but, every square foot on the site is taken up and there is no greenery. He indicated that there is no access from the parking to the building that he can see as he did not go on the property. He said he was concerned about restricting people's access from the road and thinks the corner is dangerous with all the trucks at Fitts Mill and parking all taken up now. He asked how much is enough and where is the green area now. Mr. Hallin said it was in a fenced area.

Mr. Taylor asked for clarification if the front parking spaces were gravel and Mr. Wynne asked how big the existing building was. Mr. Hallin said the front spaces are paved and the existing building is 40' x 80'. Mr. Limbacher asked who uses the building. Mr. Hallin said he does and Devlin Roofing and the apartments. Mr. Limbacher said that the existing building seems to have truck traffic. Ms. Burbine said that Devlin parks with a long full truck at the curb. Chairman Pritchard asked how much the open space changes from the current permit. Mr. Mirabito said the current open space is 50% of the lot. Chairman Pritchard asked for the numbers now and how much was for the original permit. Mr. Mirabito said there was no requirement in the existing permit and the open space is 45%. Mr. Hallin said it is 1000 sq. ft. less than before. Chairman Pritchard said the numbers suggest a 10% reduction. Mr. Taylor questioned if removing the gravel parking and moving the proposed building over to the setback line would help. Ms. Harbottle reminded him there will be parking immediately adjacent on the next lot. Ms. Burbine read from the 2001 decision that said the site is supposed to be a carpentry shop and has a roofing contractor present. Mr. Monteiro said the lot is a postage stamp and doesn't see the open space. Mr. Limbacher said moving the building over 12' won't make a difference as it will create other problems. Chairman Pritchard asked what the proposed use of the new building would be. Mr. Hallin said business and retail and he is not sure what retail yet. Chairman Pritchard said that more than 50% of the first floor is supposed to be retail. Ms. Harbottle said that provision does not apply to Union Street. She inquired what portion of the property that is in the Watershed Protection District is in a Zone A. Mr. Mirabito said none.

Mr. Mirabito said the open space requirement in the district is 20% and the apartments above are allowed as a right. He said the site is in the Business and Village Business Overlay Districts with a larger density permitted in this area. He indicated they can meet the 10' setback by moving the building and this area is zoned for a denser use. He said that if the larger project at Fitts Mill does come to fruition, then it makes sense to change the traffic flows. Chairman Pritchard asked if there had been a traffic study. Mr. Mirabito said the use is too small to warrant a study. Mr. Monteiro said the corner is dangerous enough and the proposal will restrict public access.

Chairman Pritchard asked for the thoughts of the Board. Ms. Burbine said deny. Mr. Limbacher said moving the building won't solve the problem. Chairman Pritchard said he thought the objective was to create density in this area with safe access. Mr. Limbacher said it wasn't to create density at all costs and the retail component was to support the building. He said that the pedestrian routing does not make sense. Mr. Hallin asked if the structure or other things are the issue. Chairman Pritchard summarized that it is the location, massing and how it fits with the surrounding area. Mr. Hallin said that he can shift the building. He said he was told to go with the building close to the front setback and told to go to the Design Review Committee which he has done. Chairman Pritchard indicated that the idea was to have walking access in the front of the building not cars. Mr. Hallin asked if it was fair to say to match the setback of the building next door. Mr. Taylor said he would like to see that to meet zoning and create the street wall, but the right to develop is based on zoning and safety.

Ms. Harbottle said the use is not allowed by right and it requires a supermajority vote of the Board. She said the project needs to meet the intent and standards and if the Board doesn't see it that way then they have the right to disapprove the project. Mr. Monteiro said there is no room to shift the building. Ms. Harbottle indicated that the way the site is developed with parking on the northwest side is not in accordance with the plan. She said the impervious parking area has grown from the original plan and there could be room for another building if the parking had not expanded. Mr. Hallin said that if safety is the issue and he changed the building, could he come back to the Board. Chairman Pritchard asked if there was thought to have just a single story cape. Mr. Hallin indicated

negatively as the apartments are more valuable than the space below. Chairman Pritchard said he would like to look at what was originally approved to see where things are coming from. Mr. Monteiro said nobody would like this in their neighborhood as it is so congested. Mr. Hallin said it is less dense than the project next door. Mr. Taylor said that maybe this is the wrong site for this although the housing would be affordable. Mr. Limbacher said the Board should take action now or have changes, but both are under the control of the applicant. Mr. Hallin said he could ask for an extension. Mr. Monteiro asked what modification would be acceptable to the Board. Chairman Pritchard said that the applicant should have the opportunity to see if there is an acceptable solution.

Ms. Burbine moved to accept the applicant's request to continue the public hearing for the Mixed Use Special Permit in the Village Business Overlay District for 4 Union Street until December 22, 2016 at 7:30 pm. Mr. Limbacher seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved. Mr. Mirabito said the drainage will not be done, but layout for the building and parking will be. The Board also asked for the existing conditions as well as the traffic pattern of the existing commercial space.

Public Hearing – Accessory Dwelling Special Permit – 91 Humarock Beach

Assessor's Map/Block/Lot 72-4-18

Applicant/Owner: Jacquelyne Murphy/Jacquelyne G M Vaughan

Documents

- Letter, application, deed and Accessory Dwelling Site Plan for 91 Humarock Beach dated 10/31/16 by Ross Engineering
- Murphy Residence 91 Humarock Beach Permit Set dated 4/28/16 by Rockwood Design, Inc. consisting of floor plans, sections and elevations drawings A1, A2, A2.1, A3 – A9
- Transmittal to departments dated 11/8/16
- Email from Jennifer Keefe dated 11/22/16 on need for septic system variance and letter dated 11/30/16
- Email to the Board dated 11/28/16 with above materials
- Email to the Board from Laura Harbottle dated 11/29/16 forwarding an email from Deputy Fire Chief Alfred Elliott

Paul Mirabito was present for the applicant who would like to permit an accessory dwelling on her property at 91 Humarock Beach. He indicated that the existing dwelling has been demolished and piles are in for the new foundation as a foundation permit has been obtained. He indicated a Section 6 Finding was granted from the ZBA, there is an Order of Conditions from the Conservation Commission and there will be a public hearing with the Board of Health for a septic system as variances are needed for the setbacks, but he indicated the Board would grant it. He said the house needed to be demolished in order to do the testing for the septic system.

Mr. Mirabito indicated the accessory dwelling would be located over the garage and that the two parking spaces for the accessory dwelling would be in the garage. He indicated there is an easement across the way with four parking spaces for the main house. He indicated that the stairs in the garage will service the accessory dwelling. Mr. Mirabito reviewed the floor plan of the house with the Board and the entrances to the house. Ms. Burbine asked how big the original house that was torn down was. Ms. Harbottle said about 1200 sq. ft. and had a larger footprint. Mr. Mirabito said the summer house footprint was smaller.

Ms. Harbottle indicated that the footprint of the existing house was approximately 43' X 31' with a sizeable deck and was one story with about 1250 sq. ft. of space. She indicated the proposed house is to be about 3,500 sq. ft. which is sizeable increase. She indicated that comments were received from the Board of Health who indicated that the septic system cannot be approved without a public hearing as variances are required to fit the system. She said the applicant wanted to wait until the house was demolished in order to design a septic system to fit around the pilings; the Fire Chief has indicated that the house will be difficult to provide fire protection and a sprinkler system is needed which will cost approximately 5,000 to 10,000 dollars; the Water Department has indicated the water service needs upgrading; and the parking is problematic as the accessory dwelling's parking must be on site which would be in the garage and there is only 16 feet outside which is not room enough for another car. She said the parking is depended upon the owner of 91 Humarock Beach paying 2/7 of the taxes for the lot where the parking is located. She said if the taxes are not paid, the parking easement vanishes creating a problem. She also indicated that the ZBA approved a side setback of 3.8 feet which makes more of the proposed dwelling vulnerable due to the narrow setback. She said there was a narrow setback before, but now it is much larger. She indicated that some of the lot is located in front of the seawall. She said it is a difficult lot for an accessory dwelling.

Mr. Taylor asked if the accessory dwelling was within the 40% requirement. Ms. Harbottle said it is within on the size of the new house. Chairman Pritchard asked how the accessory dwelling is accessed. Ms. Harbottle said there is only one access to the accessory unit. Mr. Mirabito said there are two. He said the owner could build the new home now, but they would like an accessory dwelling. He said the new home will be less nonconforming. He said that percolation tests could not be done until the house was torn down as the septic system needs to go under the house. He said it will be an upgrade of the existing septic system and they are entitled to it after a public hearing. He said the Fire Department is not requiring sprinklers, but recommending them. He said most lots are very close together down there. He said the criteria for an accessory dwelling are met. Chairman Pritchard asked Mr. Mirabito to address the parking. Mr. Mirabito said that there was no problem as there is a parking easement. Chairman Pritchard said that he heard that the easement is based upon payment of taxes.

Ms. Burbine said she is a proponent of accessory dwellings; however, this does not meet the requirements due to the parking being in an easement that taxes have to be paid for in perpetuity, concerns about fire department access, an increase in the intensity of use of the property, not having two means of access/egress and the applicant is saying there is a hardship to put in the new house so the accessory dwelling is needed. She said the hardship is not the problem of the Board. She indicated that the ZBA gave a finding so that a mcmansion could go there. She said the Board's purview is the accessory dwelling which can only be accessed through the garage. Mr. Taylor asked that assuming there was no accessory dwelling, could the applicant build with the parking they have. Ms. Harbottle said they don't need a garage, but off street parking and said that the Board's review is aimed at making a good development and be good for the long term as well. She said the house is in the velocity zone and there are issues with emergency services. She indicated it is questionable if there should be a more intensive use of the property in this area. She said an accessory dwelling functions differently. Mr. Wynne commented that if the Fire Dept. wants sprinklers then they are required. He said sprinklers and egress are deal breakers for him. He also commented that he did not like the unstable parking situation. Mr. Mirabito said it was not unusual at all to have parking on other property in Humarock. He said there was never parking for that house on the lot and it has always been in the easement. He said the owner will live in the accessory dwelling and her daughter in the main house. He said the easement devalues the other vacant property. Chairman Pritchard

said the board does not want the owner not to pay the taxes and have no place to park and doesn't want parking everywhere.

Mr. Wynne reiterated his concern about egress and sprinklers and the unstable parking situation. Ms. Burbine agreed and said if the Board approved the accessory dwelling they would require sprinklers. Mr. Mirabito said they could get a building permit for the house without sprinklers if the Fire Department signs off. He asked for a 60 day continuance.

Ms. Burbine moved to accept the applicant's request to continue the public hearing for 91 Humarock Beach until January 26, 2017 at 7:30 pm and extend the time to file the decision until February 10, 2017. Mr. Limbacher seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.

50 Country Way Performance Bond

Documents

- Chessia Bond Estimate 8/2/16
- Email from McDougall Brothers with bond estimate dated 3/18/16

Ms. Harbottle indicated that the Historical Commission has voted to raze the house at 50 Country Way with the condition that a plaque be installed inside the replica. She indicated the sewer issue is still unresolved. She indicated that John Chessia did a cost estimate for a performance bond as included in condition 29 e of the decision. She said the amount he came up with is \$533,000 which included a 15% contingency added. Chairman Pritchard asked if there was a line item for project management if someone else has to complete the bond work. Ms. Harbottle said that Mr. Chessia took the contractors estimate and also added in sewer, water and site walls. Chairman Pritchard said he would like to see 10% added for the project management. The Board indicated with a base cost of \$533,000 plus 10% the amount of the bond should be \$587,000.

Ms. Burbine moved to accept a performance bond for 50 Country Way per Condition 29 e of the Mixed Use Special permit decision dated 5/21/15 in the amount of \$587,000. The bond will cover parking, landscaping, walkways and other amenities including the emergency access egress/path. Mr. Limbacher seconded the motion. Chairman Pritchard asked that water, sewer and project management be clearly added in the last sentence to read "The bond will cover water, sewer, landscaping, walkways and other amenities including the emergency access/egress path plus project management." Mr. Limbacher seconded the amended motion. Motion was unanimously approved.

Endorsement of 704 Country Way Common Driveway

Documents

- Mylar for Common Driveway and Stormwater Permit Plan for 704 Country Way Lots 1A and 2A revised dated 11/30/16 by Morse Engineering Co., Inc.

Ms. Harbottle said that she is starting to ask that all common driveways be recorded at the Registry of Deeds.

Ms. Burbine moved to endorse the Common Driveway and Stormwater Permit Plan for 704 Country Way Lots 1A and 2A revised dated 11/30/16 by Morse Engineering Co., Inc. as it is consistent with

the plan approved by the Board and the Conservation Commission on which the Order of Conditions is based. Mr. Limbacher seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.

Budget FY 18

Documents

- Memo to Town Administrator on request for Assistant Planner
- Proposed FY 18 Planning Board Budget

Ms. Harbottle indicated that the direction departments received was to level fund their budgets. She indicated she did put in funding for an assistant planner due to the increased work load with Green Communities, the Economic Development Commission and coastal issues. She said last year she did put in for a shared assistant planner/conservation enforcement officer, but that was not granted. She said that some help for enforcement was provided this fall. She also indicated that she would like to investigate having a permitting ombudsman to help with commercial and business applications, although she said she had not discussed it with the EDC. Ms. Harbottle said she did not think either item would be funded; however it is important to ask so needs may be met in the future.

Chairman Pritchard asked how do you prioritize what you don't do if additional personnel are not hired. Ms. Harbottle said it is difficult. Ms. Burbine said that the Planning Board, Board of Health and Conservation Commission are all short staffed and more help would save money. Mr. Taylor said that it seems like the Planning Board is more reactionary because there is too much to do. Ms. Harbottle indicated that work is progressing on the Open Space Plan, the Affordable Housing Plan has been completed and the Masterplan was last updated in 2004.

Ms. Harbottle reviewed the department goals with the Board. She indicated regulating coastal development is important particularly in the velocity zone. Chairman Pritchard asked that sea level rise be considered. Ms. Harbottle indicated that goals tied to the Open Space and Recreation Plan include elimination of "rat tail" lots and possibly increasing minimum lot size in some areas. Chairman Pritchard asked how this relates to open space. She said the goal for this is that each house has space and is not congested. Ms. Burbine said that the Board discussed lot coverage years ago. Chairman Pritchard said location is important to consider for lot coverage as density is desired around the transit areas. He asked that a line item be included in this years' budget for masterplan development – a cost to develop how to do a masterplan.

Accounting

Documents

- PO # 1705823 (\$910.00), PO # 1705824 (\$455.00), PO # 1705826 (\$195.00), PO # 1705846 (\$88.00)

Ms. Burbine moved to approve the requisitions to Merrill Corporation of \$910.00 for construction inspections for 35 Dreamwold Common Driveway, \$455.00 to Merrill Corporation for construction inspections for 6 Old Country Way and for \$195.00 to Merrill Corporation for the pre-construction meeting for 105 Hatherly Road residential compound development and for \$88.00 to Walker Electric to remove the temporary electrical service from Kimberly Estates. Mr. Limbacher seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.

Minutes

Ms. Burbine voted to approve the meeting minutes of 11/10/16. Mr. Taylor seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved with Mr. Limbacher abstaining from the vote as he was absent.

Liaison Reports/Town Planner Report

Mr. Taylor asked if 4 Union Street had had an informal meeting with the Board or Town Planner as it would have helped Ms. Harbottle said she didn't think they had met with her. The Board said the bylaw strongly recommends a pre-application meeting. She said she would have recommended that they come in for an informal discussion with the Board.

Discussions on sewer continued. Ms. Burbine said that the proponents of 50 Country Way did not know the sewer main was undersized. Ms. Harbottle indicated that DPW is changing their approach and asking all applicants for their flows and pipe sizes to determine if the project will work in the permitting phase. The Board added that they would like to add to the goals to have all departments respond to projects when the transmittals are routed to them so intelligent decisions can be made.

Old Business and New Business

Documents

- Email to Board dated 11/23/16 from Karen Joseph with agenda for 12/1/16 meeting and meeting minutes from 11/10/16
- Email to the Board dated 11/30/16 from Karen Joseph with revised Planning Board agenda for 12/1/16

These items were distributed to the Board electronically.

Mr. Limbacher moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:20 p.m. Ms. seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Joseph
Planning Board Secretary

Ann Burbine, Clerk
12 – 22- 16
Date Approved