



RECEIVED
BARBARA STATS

2021 MAR 11 PM 12:26 Town of North Reading
Massachusetts

Community Planning

TOWN CLERK
NORTH READING, MA

MINUTES

Tuesday, February 16, 2021

Mr. Warren Pearce, Chairperson called the Tuesday, February 16, 2021 meeting of the Community Planning Commission to order at 7:30p.m. via Virtual Meeting (Zoom, participants may call 1-301-715-8592, meeting code 9854300926.

MEMBERS

PRESENT:

Warren Pearce, Chairperson
Christopher Hayden, Vice Chairperson
Ryan Carroll, Clerk
David Rudloff

STAFF

PRESENT:

Danielle McKnight, AICP
Town Planner/Community Planning Administrator
Debra Savarese, Administrative Assistant

Mr. Hayden read: Pursuant to Governor Baker's March 12, 2020 Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A, §18, and the Governor's March 15, 2020 Order imposing strict limitations on the number of people that may gather in one place, this meeting of the North Reading Community Planning Commission IS BEING CONDUCTED VIA REMOTE PARTICIPATION. No in-person attendance of members of the public will be permitted, but every effort will be made to ensure that the public can adequately access the proceedings as provided for in the Order. A reminder that persons who would like to listen to this meeting while in progress may do so by calling in 1-301-715-8592 and meeting code 9854300926.

Mr. Pearce informed all present that the meeting is being recorded.

4, 12 & 14 Concord Street – zoning discussion

Attorney Jill Mann of Mann & Mann PC stated that she is representing Mr. Sergio Coviello. He is the current owner of 4, 12 and 14 Concord Street which consists of 16 acres and would like to rezone these properties. She presented a plan of the property; dated 3/18/991. The property is located right before the junction with Park Street and consists of 16 acres. This property was where the Turkey Farm resided and was under Chapter 61 (agriculture). The town had the "Right of 1st refusal" it went to Town Meeting for approval to purchase, but did not receive a supporting vote. The intention would be to take the property and actually develop it for the Industrial Office use. His point would be to bring his business here. He's been doing very well, his business is growing and he needs more space. Mr. Coviello lives in town and he would just like to come to this property and to develop it for other than residential purposes. He has no desire to build it out for residential use, but that's the only proposal that would exist presently, unless of course there's something in the works or the town votes to approve the change in use to I/O. We thought it was a good change because the property is adjacent to the I/O District and is on Concord Street which is not an insubstantial street. The property was used commercially, but was clearly a farm, but it was also resale component that was used up front. The property is separated by its closest abutter by an old undeveloped street and there is no intention to develop it. They wanted to come to this board and did notify some of the abutter's before sending around a citizen's petition and submitting it to the Select Board.

Mr. Rudloff asked where they intend to exist out of that property. He also asked if BobCat was the abutter next to the property.

Attorney Mann pointed to the right of the property on Concord Street. The RA District does require 160' of frontage, but she thinks that this may be a little smaller than that, but is grandfathered. There is more than the 520 sq. ft. of frontage, so they have the right to access, even if there were to continue to use these as residential for the time being. There is always going to be sufficient frontage for all of them, and this would be the area closer to where the I/O District is. It is BobCat, but on the abutter's list they are known as CatStar, and they were notified of this meeting.

Diane Welch of 13 Concord Street stated that they live directly across from 4 and 12 and will suffer the consequences of 14. This probably isn't the venue for it, but Concord Street itself, is a disaster. It's long been ignored by the town as far as repair and safety, and the entry way to 14 is about a 75' area, it's on a hill and a curve, so is anything going to be done if that's going to be the entrance and the egress. Is anything going to be done, as far as traffic studies to make that safe.

Mr. Pearce stated that right now, they don't have any request before them for that, so they can't really comment on that because there's going to be a plan of something that will be submitted and that plan will answer a lot of those questions. Primarily, what he's looking for is what concerns there are, so that Mr. Coviello can have an opportunity to address them. His understanding is that the concerns are traffic and people entering and exiting the property. That will be addressed if a plan is brought forward, but Mr. Coviello still has to get through town meeting approval.

Diane Welch asked if there was just going to be one building on the property, or similar to his property down the street.

Mr. Pearce stated they don't have a design, yet. Once Mr. Coviello finds out what he is able to do with the property those questions will be answered.

Camille Welch of 13 Concord Street asked what Industrial Office is.

Mr. Pearce stated that it's kind of what they see on Concord Street now. Office type uses, light industrial.

Diane Welch asked if that means that no trucks will be coming in?

Mr. Pearce stated that some of these businesses require trucks to move stuff in and out.

Diane Welch stated that having trucks parked across the street from their family home of 61 years is very sad for them and she just wants to be sure that they're not going to put another business there that is like the rest of the street. Because the town isn't giving the residents on Concord Street any information and no attention when they do call to ask for changes.

Mr. Pearce stated that this is the time to have something to say and voice your concerns.

Camille Welch stated that she was told by the police department that they couldn't put a light in for safety here because other residents will think they're playing favorites and she thinks that is a sick reply to her request to get lighting and that's just one of the issues.

Diane Welch stated that Concord street is very neglected by the town and this hurts a lot for not just residents here, but the entire west end.

Mr. Pearce stated that a lot of times when a new development is done, they get some off-site improvements on the roadways.

Brett Maloney stated that he is Trustee for 408 Park Street which is diagonally across the street from the Turkey Farm. He's not familiar with Mr. Coviello and his business and wanted to know what type of business he's planning to move it there.

Mr. Pearce stated that Mr. Coviello has an electrical business.

Brett Maloney asked if it's going to end up being industrial condos or is he just going to build one building.

Mr. Pearce stated that they don't have a plan yet and it's going to be determined by how town meeting goes.

Sergio Coviello stated that he bought the property to move his business there. He cannot do it on residential and he spoke to a bunch of neighbors to discuss his plan.

Mrs. McKnight stated that this is just an informal meeting. Once the petition is submitted we will schedule and advertise the public hearing.

Paul Denaro of 402 Park Street stated that he is adjacent to the property from the east side. He stated that he did not receive a notice about this meeting and wants to be sure that he is included in any future notices.

Attorney Mann stated that his name and address is on the abutter's list and he should have received a notice. He has no objection to having the property zoned commercially.

Brett Maloney asked if the zoning is approved will that allow it to then creep further down Concord and Park Street.

Mr. Pearce stated that Mr. Coviello is looking too strictly to rezone his property and nobody else's land. If other property owners want to rezone their property, they would need to go to town meeting to get approval.

Minutes

Mr. Carroll moved, seconded by Mr. Rudloff and voted 4-0:
that the Community Planning Commission vote to approve the minutes of January 19, 2021 as written.

Mr. Carroll moved, seconded by Mr. Rudloff and voted 4-0:
that the Community Planning Commission vote to approve the minutes of February 2, 2021 as written.

Mr. Carroll moved, seconded by Mr. Hayden and voted 4-0:
that the Community Planning Commission vote to approve the minutes of February 9, 2021 as written.

Mallard Lane – bond release

Mr. Carroll moved, seconded by Mr. Rudloff and voted 4-0:

that the Community Planning Commission vote to accept the January 4, 2021 report from Design Consultants, Inc. for the Mallard Lane subdivision and that the balance of \$57,169.20 be released.

Mr. Carroll moved, seconded by Mr. Hayden and voted 4-0:

that the Community Planning Commission vote to release the Site Opening bond in the amount of \$5,000.00 for the Mallard Lane subdivision.

**104 Lowell Street/Martins Landing – Priority Development Site Master Permit Revision
cont. P.H. 8:00PM**

Mr. Carroll moved, seconded by Mr. Hayden and voted 4-0:

that the Community Planning Commission vote to grant the requested continuance for the public hearing for 104 Lowell Road/Martins Landing until Tuesday, March 16, 2021 @ 8:00PM.

Main & Winter Street - discussion

Mr. David Eisen of Abacus Architects stated that what they wanted to do with this draft presentation that they recommend, and probably are the ones to present it to the landowners, other stakeholders, boards, committees, to the public and Select Board to tell them what they've been doing and what their recommendations are. So, the first half of this presentation

sums up essentially what you already know. He thought it would go through that pretty quickly and then the second half, talks about what they've found out in the past six weeks, or so, talking to a whole series of development professionals. He presented a PowerPoint presentation. (See attached)

Mr. Vincenzo Stuto of the Select Board stated that unless its 4-stories plus, it seems that this developer said it's just not economically viable. Coincidentally, to get it, the way we want now, where it looks aesthetically pleasing, it's only worth as much as the land, so that doesn't make any sense. Though, it seems like some of the things you showed on the PowerPoint that would make it work, it's like a developer's wish list. We have to take this to the town, and he can tell you right now we're having a problem just getting an existing project for a fifth story. If Mr. Eisen thinks that it's worth getting a couple more developers to maybe give an opinion or is it a waste of time.

Mr. Eisen stated that there have been several developers commenting on the project and they keep hearing the same thing over and over. They have had short conversations with two other developers, who they want to hear back from, but they didn't wait for any of that because their hearing the same thing and were not working for the developers, were working for this town. This is also what they're seeing in many towns who are having the same battles, but it's happening because it doesn't change. It's not their job to advocate for developers, but this is what they're hearing and he thinks absolutely the conversations should continue.

Mr. Stuto stated that as part of their report when it came to our recommendation because we definitely have to go to the stakeholders. Was there any kind of economic analysis done at what price it would be worth to sell? Some of these businesses, there are pretty successful especially one that you know, has a big donut on it, so he thinks that they're under estimating what some people may want for their land.

Mr. Eisen stated that some of their senses, and he believes that Mrs. McKnight passed on some information, that the best way to do this is not for us to do an independent economic and evaluation of real businesses. It is to meet up with those owners and say that they are selling a bazillion donuts and their business seems to be really viable. What would it take for them to work with us to advantage the entire Town of North Reading and then carve out a place for themselves and would they be willing to talk to a developer. They'll get that corner and that donut shop, but it's part of a larger development. The rule of thumb that sort of 10 million assessed value that's a really crude estimate, but it gives a sense of things, and then there are people who may say they're losing money, or someone may say that their great grandfather built this business, and they will never sell and that's not something we can get from an economic analysis. And it may be that one or two owners will never sell and then we can work around it. It doesn't need to stop this dead in its tracks. We need to talk to the big landowners and those most willing to send it. Could you work around the existing donut shop?

Mr. Stuto stated that on that slide where the developer said that the town has to pay for the wastewater plant or there be sewer, did they tell you what the preference is?

Mr. Eisen stated that the preference would be sewer. There was only one developer that stated they would not do a development around a package plant, but then again, all of this is subject to negotiation. People change their tune if you can move forward in four areas, maybe they can deal with the fifth area not getting exactly what they want.

Mr. Stuto stated that sewer would make this conversation a lot easier and would open it up to maybe more developers.

Mr. Eisen stated that it certainly not going to drive people away if there's real sewer or a treatment plan in place.

Mr. Rudloff asked what the breakdown is to capacity for the 3 million system that they estimated. How much of it's for food, restaurants and how much for residential. Is there any kind of pie chart about capacity when they're making that assessment of 3 million in the area needed for it?

Mr. Eisen stated that they took the MAPC market study and then they "upped it" like 50% because MAPC was looking at the shorter term, and it was a couple of years old and it's driving more demand and they're saying there aren't going to be that many restaurants, but we're thinking, maybe there could be a bunch more if you want a town center.

Mr. Rudloff asked what the area is that they showed in the parking lot. Could it be scaled out of those parking spots, but roughly what in square footage was that area.

Mr. Eisen stated that he would have to review and get Mr. Rudloff the answer.

Mr. Rich Wallner of the Select Board asked about the slide of the number of years 161 plus 72. Is that the three floor concept or is it the four floor.

Mr. Eisen stated what they've been showing is three floors. Its two floors of residential and one floor of retail. At some areas three floors of residential and others, and a significant number of townhouses.

Mr. Wallner asked if it goes to four floors do they have an estimate of how many units, separately.

Mr. Eisen stated if you bumped it up a floor and parking comes with it. So, if you bump it up a floor of residential, parking would need to be bumped up, so you could get 300, 400 or 450 units. This is the kind of range their talking about with the heights.

Abigail Hurlbut, Chairman of the Facilities Master plan asked what percent of the developed part of the parcel, not including wetlands, the places people might actually walk around on a regular basis, is grass, as opposed to blacktop roads.

Mr. David Pollack of Abacus Architects stated that they can't answer that in real time, but they can definitely do an analysis and get it to Mrs. McKnight for distribution to you and everybody else. He thinks what they've done in many ways is maximized the usable open space, the greenspace, by creating a focal point in the center of town upon the point by creating the green down the center of the site, which is sort of a linear park and then by at least conceptually opening up Martin's Brook and having access to it from the community building at the south end of the site, so that there can be useable open space there and then developing a kind of street section that would have trees and grass strips along with parallel parking instead of just parking lots. It's not the same usable open space, but he thinks focusing on those three quality usable open spaces of the pedestrian mall down the middle of the park up on the intersection and whatever kind of passive recreation, or whatever the town would want to do to develop the brook.

Mr. Eisen stated that they didn't focus on quantity, because they kind of focused on the quality, to make sure that green space was usable. To answer the question about parking, he would have to say that 1) is too much parking and 2) not enough parking.

Abigail Hurlbut stated that she understands that, but when you put a large development in like that, and the bulk of the open land for lack of a better term is basically at the junction of too busy streets which is not really the primo part of the package. The junction of Main Street and Rte. 62, and the rest of it, other than the median strip going towards the center is either building sidewalks or parking lots, or cross streets, so that's sort of what caused her to ask the question, roughly what percentage of the project is delegated to parking spaces and maybe that's not the right question, but it just looks to her as if this was going to be a lot of parking, a lot of apartments, a lot shops and a lot of traffic.

Mr. Eisen stated that for the developers their reaction is "wow" that's a lot of greenspace. They're not going to pay for all of that greenspace. They'll chip in, but they want the town to contribute, and there's not enough parking. But, all of this can be moved around, this is not a final plan. This is all part of the negotiation.

Mr. Pearce stated that one of the things they have to keep in mind here because it sometimes gets lost in the whole discussion, is what happens if we do nothing. What kind of development will happen? Because housing is such a high demand maybe some of these parcels will get turned into housing and they'll come before us to build four or five story buildings and then we get them with no control over how they go in. However, they could fit on these properties so there's a possibility that we can end up with some of these things that we're talking about and we say that we don't really like that, and then we end up with it anyway.

Mr. Eisen stated that really the issue is solid public benefits. You may not think it's quite enough greenspace, but that network of greenspace, we do believe it is a wonderful public asset and if you have piecemeal development you'll never get a coherent connection weaving this way through.

Mrs. McKnight stated that she doesn't know if they would want to have further discussions of what they actually do want to take as their next step, and when they might want to take it. In terms of actual engagement with property owners, whether further discussion is needed before that happens, she doesn't know if they wanted to talk about that a bit.

Mr. Pollack stated that the first thing they heard from every development profession that they talked to which is that that's the gateway to get the conversation started. A signed letter of interest that is not binding on anybody, but it demonstrates that everybody has been talked to and everybody is curious and that there's an opportunity for a developer to pitch to the landowners without a big investment because until they can get control of the land they're not going to want to start paying surveyors or geotechnical consultants or anybody to start to get any kind of traction of what it would cost them to do a real development, which would then underpin whatever kind of offer they'd be willing to make to purchase everything. He does think it's important if you want to move this forward to go to the landowners and have a conversation about it.

Mr. Eisen stated if the CPC wants them to take the lead they would be happy to do that.

Mr. Pearce stated that it's more than just getting the development done, its will these landowners be interested in doing something that betters the town. That are willing to be part of that process. He knows some of them are, but perhaps and hopefully we can find enough of them that are. It's going to be a situation where we try to put together a project that is financially viable as well. So, then you would concur that the next step for us, would be to put together some kind of a public meeting and get as many stakeholders there, as possible and give them a presentation. He doesn't think that Zoom is a good way to hold a meeting with the landowners. Setting up a room and showing them on a PowerPoint would be the best way to communicate with these people, but he doesn't think we're there yet because of the Covid restrictions.

Mr. Eisen stated that he has heard from other people that they're thankful they don't have to drive in the middle of the night, sitting in a draft room. Their recommendation would be not to wait. They can make Zoom work and he doesn't think that it will be a huge public meeting of 300 people. It has to be a public meeting, but the focus is really on the landowners. We could also do individual landowners in a ½ hour slot.

Mr. Hunter of 71 Winter Street stated that he has seen stuff about this, but never been reached out to by anyone. He would like to know how much time Abacus Architects has spent in the area.

Mr. Pearce stated that one of the reasons, as you can hear, were trying to put together some kind of a plan, so that they can go out and talk to all of the stakeholders, but we wanted to get something where we had answers to the questions that are going to be asked by everybody.

Mr. Eisen stated that he has been out to the site a number of times, walking around.

Mr. Hunter stated that the plan seems like everyone's doing the same that was done at the Lynnfield Market Street and doesn't think that this would go well in our community and it's a difficult area with the traffic.

Abigail Hurlbut stated that she has toured the town buildings in the town David Pollack and David Eisen and she thinks that they have spent a certain amount of time getting to know the community, so while she understands your concerns and she agrees with them. I think they still have a reasonable understanding. The Facilities Master Plan committee has been looking at a number town buildings, not the least of which is town hall and a community center and she thinks that we're sort of working in opposite directions and she thinks it would be very good going forward, if we can all be in touch with one another on a more reasonable bases because the ideas that Abacus has come up with under the auspices of the CPC are somewhat different from what the Facilities Master Plan has been working on.

Mr. Eisen stated that because the CPC only meets every two weeks would it make sense for them to work with Mrs. McKnight over the next few days or a week or two, so that we don't run on for weeks, for the committee to get back together.

Mr. Pearce stated that if we're going to do the Zoom meeting that would probably be a good idea.

Mrs. McKnight stated that before we invite the stakeholders and everything, there were a few things she wanted to clarify. It sounds like there are some issues that are still to be discussed. For example: The problems that Abacus has brought to our attention. Are we willing to consider any more floors or residential units? Are these deal breakers? Do we still want to press ahead with these issues? Can we reach out to the landowners anyway, even if those questions are unanswered? If we are going to reach out to stakeholders, are those just the owners of the 9 or 10 properties in there, or are we including the direct, immediate abutters.

Mr. Pearce stated that they should include everybody. He knows that it's important for the CPC to decide the number of stories, he thinks that the input from them is also going to help decided the number of stories that would be acceptable because if we look at a situation where the ability to make the thing financially viable doesn't work for the neighborhood or for anybody, were not going to get the vote and if we don't get the vote, were not going to do it.

Consensus of the CPC is to contact the immediate abutters.

Mr. Stuto stated that he thinks that the town should be the one that spearheads this project. The EDC could lead this charge and then come back and make a recommendation. He doesn't think that Abacus should take the lead in front of the town.

Mr. Pearce asked Mrs. McKnight what she thinks.

Mrs. McKnight stated that she would prefer to have Abacus give the presentation, but it should definitely be sponsored/hosted by the town. She doesn't know how involved the EDC has actually been with this project and it would be great if they became involved, but she doesn't think that the CPC should turn ownership of the project over to the EDC.

Mr. Hayden stated that being an associate to the EDC, they should be brought up to date on the project, but not a good time to let them take the lead on this.

Mr. Pearce stated that it would be good to have the support of the EDC, but the CPC will do the invite and set up the meeting, and Abacus can do the presentation

Mike Gilleberto, Town Administrator stated from his experiences with a couple of projects over the past few years, he thinks that it's really important that the landowners see that there are town officials who are sort of standing in a leadership role, be it the planning commission itself or the town planner, sends a really important message to them about this, because they know our faces, they know our roles. He would encourage the inclusion of the EDC. Je doesn't necessarily know when that moment, is or when that should be. He's not sure whether they are the group that should or should not be presenting, but he would strongly encourage that whenever that time arises, that they be included.

Mr. Wallner asked that the CPC combine the meetings with the Select Board.

Ipswich River Park – banners

Mr. Carroll moved, seconded by Mr. Hayden and voted 4-0:

that the Community Planning Commission vote to approve the placement of two "36 x 96" signs at Ipswich River Park/15 Central Street, special event banners at the entrance of the Ipswich River Park during the period of 5/20/2021 to 5/21/2022.

Planning Administrator Updates**Budget Hearings**

Mrs. McKnight stated that the budget hearings are scheduled for March 1st and March 15th. At this time she is unsure which meeting the CPC will be attending, but will let the board know when she finds out.

265 Main Street - charging stations

Mrs. McKnight stated that the Plaza located at 265 Main Street may be installing vehicle charging stations and she wanted to know if the board would handle this as a minor modification to a site plan. The placement of the charging station would only impact one parking space.

Mr. Pearce stated that he would like to have a plan submitted showing where the charging station will be located on the site.

The consensus of the CPC is that it would be a minor modification.

5G cellular

Mrs. McKnight stated that Mike Lynch from the City of Boston will be meeting with the CPC on March 2nd at 7:00pm to discuss the 5G cellular.

Housing Choice – grant program

Mrs. McKnight stated that she was told by the regional housing services office that we're now eligible for designation as a housing choice community. We got this by virtue of having increased our housing stock by 5% over five years, so this is the first year that we qualify and we just have to submit an application and basically we're eligible for grant money from the State.

Mr. Pearce asked what the grant money could be used for.

Mrs. McKnight stated that its capital projects. It would have to be tied to some housing development, but housing development could be housing that already exists and other kinds of infrastructure. She believes that it was either Tewksbury or Billerica that was awarded \$250,000 to help with sidewalks.

Mr. Pearce asked if this is something that could be used for the Carpenter Drive project.

Mrs. McKnight stated possibly and she can find that out. The deadline is March and she will be working with the building inspector on that.

Travel & Tourism – grant

Mrs. McKnight stated that they helped the Chamber of Commerce prepare an application for a grant that the State is offering. We're not a co-applicant, but we gave a letter of support and helped with the application. If we do get grant funds, it would be to help set up a program to help promote local businesses, and that would include building a database of businesses which would be really helpful. This is a competitive grant program, so odds are we will probably not be awarded, but even if we're not, she was going to bring it up with the EDC at their next meeting that it might be a good use of the funds. They sometimes struggle to spend and hiring someone to put together a really comprehensive website that highlights all of our businesses and business owners could opt in, put in their information. i.e. What are they doing during Covid, what are their hours and services?

Mr. Hayden stated that's a great idea.

Mr. Pearce stated that they also have some historic locations that could be highlighted, for the tourism part.

Accessory Unit Dwellings

Mrs. McKnight stated that the Gerry Noel, building inspector wanted her to be aware that they are receiving a lot of requests for second kitchens and that's fine within the same structure, but he's getting a lot of requests for accessory structures, having kitchens. So, he and I are pursuing with Town Council, how to ask for deed restrictions to be placed on those properties, so that they are not going to become second units where zoning doesn't allow that.

Mr. Pearce stated that at some point the CPC is going to have to deal with this because we haven't really put together a bylaw that gives the building inspector some direction. It's clear from all of the research that was done by the MAPC survey that people really would like to see some accessory dwellings/secondary units.

Mr. Rudloff stated that the CPC has to do something with this because they are everywhere and there's no policy, so everyone's just saying okay, I'm just going to build one. It's not safe for public safety departments like fire and police, that don't know there's an extra dwelling on the properties.

Mrs. McKnight stated that the building inspector does have the State building code that dictates what he can and can't do unless they were created during a certain time period and they're just not allowed unless there's a required separation of the required entry and exit within the same house.

Mr. Pearce stated that even if they have the required entrance and exit and all that stuff, we still don't allow accessory dwelling unit in the houses, but they're there.

Mr. Rudloff stated that there's a combination, but the detached ones are the ones that the building inspector is limited on. Even though he has police powers he's not allowed to infer (as to why they are building features or futures (MEP's) that would create a dwelling).

Mr. Pearce asked Mrs. McKnight if she thought it would be good idea to invite the building inspector to one of the CPC meetings to discuss this.

Mrs. McKnight stated that it would be good to have a conversation with him because he's the one that has been looking into this issue because it keeps coming up for him and he's the one working with Town Council on deed restrictions for new construction.

Abigail Hurlbut stated that when they considered moving to the Bay area, they looked at properties to buy with one of her kids that might have an accessory dwelling unit, and they have a pretty good system out there. Among other things, it cannot be more than 70% from the size of the primary dwelling. She does feel strongly that this community has been making a lot of noise about supporting services for seniors of which we have a lot, and this is one way of doing it. She does think that the town does need to have a policy and a set of regulations that not only allow the building inspector to do his job, but allows people to age in place with their kids.

Mr. Pearce stated that they'll put this on one of the upcoming agendas and put together something that they may be able to bring to the October Town Meeting.

Appointment of a Planning Commissioner

Mr. Hayden asked if they have a schedule yet, to appoint a new commissioner to the Select Board

Mrs. McKnight stated that she hasn't heard anything yet.

Adjournment at 9:35PM

Respectfully submitted,
Ryan Carroll, Clerk

