

**Town of Leicester Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
August 21, 2018**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jason Grimshaw, Chair; Debra Friedman, Vice-Chair; Sharon Nist, Andrew Kularski

MEMBERS ABSENT: Alaa Abusalah and Robyn Zwicker

IN ATTENDANCE: Michelle Buck, Town Planner, and Desiree Edmonds, Department Assistant.

MEETING TIME: 7:00 PM

AGENDA:

1. 7:00PM **Public Hearing, Special Permit**
Mulberry Street Solar Farm/SP2018-03 (Applicant: Syncarpha Solar, LLC)
2. 7:15PM **Discussion, Site Plan Review Application, continued**
101 Huntoon Memorial Highway/SPR2018-03 (Applicant: 101 Huntoon LLC)
3. 7:30PM **Public Hearing, Zoning Bylaw Amendments**
 - A. Backyard Chickens
 - B. Solar Moratorium
 - C. Solar Bylaw Changes
 - D. Residential Dimensional Requirements
 - E. Vehicle Related Use
 - F. Breweries, Wineries, Distilleries
4. 8:00PM **Approval of Minutes:**
8/7/2018
5. 8:30PM **Town Planner Report/General Discussion:**
 - A. Miscellaneous Project Updates
 - B. Municipal Vulnerability Preparedness Grant
 - C. Board Member Committee Updates

Jason Grimshaw called meeting to order at 7:00PM

Public Hearing, Special Permit

Mulberry Street Solar Farm/SP2018-03(Applicant: Syncarpha Solar, LLC)

Present: Abigail Pires and Carter McCann (Syncarpha), Peter Engle (Bertin Engineering), and David DeLollis (owner). Mr. Grimshaw opened the public hearing.

Ms. Pires provided background on solar incentive programs and some history on Syncarpha's previous experience in Massachusetts.

Mr. Engle stated that the site was permitted about 3 years ago under a different applicant with similar layout. The current project would combine 3 lots into one because of the new solar setbacks of 100 feet. The panels are now further from property lines. Mulberry Street allows access to the site for stormwater and detention basins. There are swales to prevent water from flowing onto neighboring properties.

Trisha Daige stated their property is abuts the solar farm. Her husband, Jack Daige, stated he has concerns about water drainage because there are slopes and had concerns about water discharging onto surrounding properties.

Mr. Engle stated there is a 50 foot buffer from property lines and panels will be at least 120 feet away from the property line. Mr. Daige wanted to know where the offsets were and what the buffer is. Mr. Engle reiterated that the minimum setback is 100 feet and the clearing buffer is 50 feet.

Mr. DeLollis Asked what the old buffer requirement was. Ms. Buck stated it was not specified; it was determined on a case-by-case basis during the permitting process.

Mr. Engle stated they will have some landscaping around basin closer than 50 feet which they may need to change if a waiver for that requirement can't be granted.

Ms. Daige asked how close the property is to the reservoir. Mr. Engle said it's about 300 ft. from the reservoir.

Ms. Daige expressed her concern about wildlife, their homes, and privacy, also having the property cleared and if it will affect their property. Mr. Daige was concerned about the runoff if cleared. Mr. Engle said they plan to seed the property after construction, and there's not much grading. They're undecided if they are going to stump or grind.

Mr. Daige asked if they typically grind stumps, clear them, or leave them in. Mr. Engle stated that they usually grind them. Ms. Pires stated that they will be leaving all stumps in place. If they don't need stumps to be moved they will not move them. The area under all panels will be mowed a couple times a year and maintained in order to prevent overgrowth.

Mr. DeLollis asked how close the stumps will be cut and what they plan to do with scraps. Mr. McCann said stumps will be cut close, and the racking will be ground screwed. They'll have the property surveyed so they will be flagging where the posts/stumps will be. They want to preserve what is existing and do not want to remove stumps that don't have to be removed.

Mr. DeLollis asked if they will hydro-seed before they begin to insert panels. Mr. Engle was unsure if they hydro-seed or use a machine that distribute solar seed mix that grows about 9 inches high. Mr. McCann stated that if they seed before panels are inserted the equipment could tear up the ground.

Mr. Daige asked about detention basins, where they will be located and what they discharge to. Mr. Engle provided an overview. One is on a hill so not much water flow will discharge from the basin, one discharges to wetlands, another to the road and another to the northeast, which eventually will be built to discharge into the reservoir.

Mr. DeLollis asked how the water from the south will discharge from the basin, because he's concerned about water dumping into neighboring property. Mr. Engle said that there is an outlet control structure, with an 18 in pipe that runs to a smaller basin so there is no direct discharge

Ms. Friedman wanted to know where basin 3 is. Mr. Engle identified it on the plan.

Mr. Daige reiterated his concern about stormwater discharge because of slopes again.

Mr. Engle said the plans are designed to not flood into properties and they must meet Massachusetts stormwater standards. Mr. McCann stated in terms of water quality around the reservoir, the panels are made of nontoxic material, so runoff is clean water. The panels are considered impervious by the DEP.

Mr. Daige says in theory their design for that will work but once vegetation is removed the slopes give water easier access to discharge. Mr. McCann stated they did math to make sure that post-construction there is less discharge than pre-construction.

Ms. Daige asked what if it doesn't work the way it is intended to work. Mr. Engle stated that if there are issues they will redesign and reconstruct to make it work correctly. Mr. McCann agreed.

Ms. Friedman asked if they have included information on the swales. Mr. Engle said the swales have enough capacity, and they have added another swale on Mulberry Street.

Mr. Daige asked where the property line on reservoir side is. Mr. Engle stated on street line, right at the trail.

Ms. Friedman asked if they have extended detention basin 3 in the revised plan? Mr. Engle said yes. Ms. Friedman asked if the revised plans have been submitted back to Kevin Quinn. Mr. Engle stated he sent email to Kevin as of 8/21/2018.

Mr. Grimshaw asked if they still had buffer issue. Mr. Engle confirmed they do, they were under the impression it was a construction standard not something that had to be reviewed by the ZBA. Ms. Buck stated that it is part of the Bylaw and we cannot waive it. Ms. Pires they can definitely abide by the setback and not clear 50 feet from lot lines. Ms. Buck states 100 feet is preferred, but they cannot clear more than 50 feet.

Ms. Nist asked if there was any enclosed building planned. Mr. Engle said only a battery storage/transformer, but no buildings such as sheds. Mr. McCann stated that with a battery they can move panel production from day to evening as needed. Ms. Nist asked if the battery area was enclosed. Mr. McCann replied yes the whole site will be completely sealed and enclosed.

Mr. Daige questioned if the area will be fenced in? Mr. Engle confirmed yes the whole site. Mr. McCann asked if the bottom of the fence is raised. Ms. Pires stated she didn't think so. Mr. McCann said the fence is usually raised 6 inches for small wildlife especially by reservoir.

Mr. Nist wanted to discuss and clarify #3 detention basins from Kevin Quinn comments. Mr. Engle stated that the basin was in zone A and they had backed it up about 50 feet south so it will now be completely outside on that zone. Mr. McCann said in terms of noise, the panels don't make sound. The inverters make about as much noise as an air conditioner. There's no interference with radio. It's a benign development. The site will be mowed two to three times a year, and maintained/visited maybe 10 times per year.

MOTION: Ms. Friedman moved to continue the hearing to 9/11/2018 at 7:15PM to address further issues.

SECOND: Mr. Grimshaw. Discussion: None.

VOTE: All in favor

Discussion, Site Plan Review Application

101 Huntoon Memorial Highway/SPR2018-03 (Applicant: 101 Huntoon, LLC)

Mr. Balcewicz discussed addressing comments from engineer Kevin Quinn. Mr. Grimshaw said we can skip all resolved comments. Mr. Balcewicz addressed the comment that the Cultec chamber is below groundwater. His opinion is that the 2' groundwater separation is only required for parking lots and collecting dirty water. This chamber will only be collecting clean roof runoff and discharging directly into chambers in order to mitigate post-development runoff.

He also indicated that the existing permeable tailings will dissipate water through the site and allow more permeability.

The next comment was related to the retaining wall, which requires a deep excavation in immediate proximity to two neighboring parcels of land. If not properly stabilized, the retaining wall construction will undermine or possibly damage the neighboring parcels. Mr. Balcewicz responded, and stated that the owner (Robert Johnson) is a structural engineer, and the owner will provide detailed narrative on how he will be constructing the wall, basically he will partially open the excavation, and as he excavates he will build the wall. Mr. Grimshaw asks if the intention is to explain the excavation and retaining wall process in the narrative. Mr. Balcewicz said yes.

Ms. Friedman stated the next step was to discuss a temporary construction easement. Mr. Balcewicz stated they do not want to pursue that; they have looked at the issue and found a way to construct a wall without undermining the neighboring parcels. Ms. Friedman asked if they will need any construction easement to work or step on the adjacent property. Mr. Balcewicz stated no and that Mr. Johnson will be providing narrative to what wall will look like. Ms. Buck stated that engineer Kevin Quinn felt that a construction easement was needed, but if they [the Applicant] has documentation proving that it's not needed that can be considered.

Mr. Johnson stated Mr. Balcewicz had put the wall far enough away so that they can build in phases so stabilization will not be an issue. They'll put it in writing. Mr. Balcewicz read Kevin Quinn's comment stating the retaining wall is in excess of 11 feet in height, and must comply with the requirements of Massachusetts State Building Code, which he has documented on his letter that it would.

Mr. Balcewicz continued reviewing comments. Mr. Quinn had noted that the gravel storage and loading in the rear of site appears to be too limited to accommodate tractor-trailers turning around, creating a safety hazard if trucks have to back out on to Huntoon Memorial Highway. Mr. Balcewicz stated that all deliveries are received in the back of the building. They drive along the right side up the gravel path that leads to the lot that is behind, and back into doorway, they then they unload and load trucks. There is no safety hazard.

Ms. Nist was curious if it's just 18 wheelers. Mr. Balcewicz stated that it is all sizes of trucks, and said trucks have to turn because of the way they have material stored in the lot. Mr. Grimshaw asked if they were able to turn around with the current condition because this was a major concern. Mr. Balcewicz replied yes, they store material on racks, with the 90' x 90' addition trucks will have to pull further up and back in, there is a steep slope that will be cut back for the retaining wall, so there will be no tractor trailers backing out on to the highway. Mr. Grimshaw stated that Mr. Balcewicz needs to have documentation of that for Kevin Quinn.

Mr. Balcewicz said he had sent Mr. Quinn a letter. Ms. Buck stated she had spoken to Mr. Quinn on the phone and he stated he needs further documentation from Mr. Balcewicz. Mr. Balcewicz was unsure if Mr. Quinn understood the revised truck route and where the deliveries took place. Mr. Grimshaw stated Mr. Balcewicz will need to provide further documentation showing how deliveries are taking place in the rear of the building. Mr. Balcewicz stated that on his letter of response to Review comments, he wrote that "No vehicles shall be backing onto Huntoon Memorial Highway."

Ms. Buck stated that Mr. Quinn wants more information on how the revised truck route will work. Mr. Balcewicz said that yes a tractor trailer will not be able to back out and turn around in one swing. However, there is ample room with the retaining wall to allow the trucks to pull up, back up and drive out. Mr. Grimshaw suggested a potential condition prohibiting any backing out onto Route 56, but Mr. Balcewicz must still run this by Mr. Quinn. Mr. Balcewicz stated they have no problem with putting a sign up, and trucks now do not back out, and he understands that with the 90' x 90' addition they have limited space, but he has seen trucks back into the bay and make a 3 point turn.

Mr. Johnson spoke with Mr. Quinn on 8/22/2018 at the site and demonstrated the truck turnaround space. Mr. Grimshaw asked if Ms. Buck had heard that from Mr. Quinn. Ms. Buck said no. Mr. Balcewicz stated he was not at the site when Mr. Quinn had spoken to Mr. Johnson.

Mr. Balcewicz recited Mr. Quinn's comment about 3 parking spaces and part of a fourth being on gravel surface, and how section 5.5.02.1, B, 3 requires that all such parking is to be on hard paved surface. Mr. Balcewicz stated that the parking spaces in unpaved locations have been withdrawn. They now have 36 spaces. They 28 full time employees and 1 part time employee.

Mr. Grimshaw stated that there was not a lot of in and out traffic as there would be with retail. They also had questions about handicap spaces. Ms. Buck stated the Applicant had added the required accessible spaces.

Mr. Balcewicz stated that he had converted 3 standards spaces into 2 van-accessible e spaces. He continued with comment #5 which states that the existing and proposed parking spaces are identified as 9' x 19', per section 5.5.02.1, B, 1 requires parking spaces to be 10' x 20.' According to Mr. Quinn's comment it appears that the parking spaces in question are located in existing areas of the site, and may have been based on previously existing standards for laying out spaces and the Board may wish to consider such spaces "grandfathered".

Mr. Grimshaw stated they had discussed the "grandfathered" decision at the previous meeting, and pointed out the outstanding issues: Cultec chamber, retaining wall, and truck turnaround. He advised Mr. Balcewicz to clarify the Cultec situation to Mr. Quinn.

Mr. Kularski suggested a sign may resolve the turnaround/back up issue. Mr. Grimshaw agreed.

Mr. Balcewicz stated business is set up to take deliveries in the back with the above rail crane and that is why they are extending the building. The building must be the same width as the crane. Mr. Grimshaw stated that Mr. Balcewicz must address the outstanding issue with Mr. Quinn so we can come to an agreement regarding the space for trucks.

Mr. Balcewicz stated that ZBA did not email him the documents he was supposed to send by certified mail. Ms. Buck stated that she is trying to standardize procedures between the Boards and that Mr. Balcewicz should be receiving those documents within the next few days.

Ms. Buck advised Mr. Balcewicz to address the stormwater issue ASAP so that they may be able to finish up with Conservation Commission due to meet 8/23/2018.

MOTION: Ms. Friedman moved to continue discussion to September 11, 2018

SECOND: Mr. Kularski. DISCUSSION: None.

VOTE: All in favor

Public Hearing, Zoning Bylaw Amendments

Mr. Grimshaw read public hearing notice.

Backyard Chickens

Ms. Buck provided background information and stated currently we require a special permit for 1 chicken. Last year, the Board attempted a bylaw allowing up to 6 chickens, turkeys, or ducks by-right. This bylaw didn't pass, so a Backyard Poultry Committee was formed to work on a bylaw. The current draft is based on the Committee's draft, modified to fit in our existing Zoning and to be more consistent with state law. We have added several new definitions, and are allowing a limited number of chickens accessory to single family or two family dwellings by-right without a special permit. Lot sizes will determine the number of chickens allowed. A purpose and intent was added to allow the raising of backyard chickens for the personal consumption of eggs and meats, to protect the rights of abutters, and to preserve natural water resources. The bylaw also states that people must comply with Board of Health requirements and obtain an annual license from the Town Clerk; we will continue to work on requirements for licensing. Ms. Buck also modified the footnote in subsection 3.2.01 agriculture table (to be consistent with changes in state law related to agriculture).

Ms. Friedman wanted to point out that this bylaw amendment was the work of the committee, which included representation from the Agricultural Commission, Board of Health, 2 members at large and the Animal Control Officer and she appreciates their input and hard work.

Heidi Cooper (Agricultural Commission) wanted to thank us for the updated amendment, and stated she was disappointed by some of the members of the committee for not actively participating. She asked if the special permit application fee was a one-time fee. Ms. Friedman answered yes it's a one-time fee and stated once approved, it stays with the property. She said that if someone is looking to have chickens long-term a special permit would be necessary. Ms. Cooper expressed her appreciation for this bylaw because townspeople haven't been able to come to an agreement.

Mr. Grimshaw stated this was a finely crafted bylaw addressing all. Ms. Friedman agreed and added it was a good collaborative effort and everyone has learned a lot.

Harry Brooks (Select Board) asked that with less than 7,000 sf do you have to go to the ZBA or is keeping of chickens not allowed. Ms. Friedman stated that you can get a special permit. The applicant would pay \$175.00 fee and apply to ZBA but they should not be giving special permits out for a 7,000 sf lot.

Ms. Buck wanted to clarify if we are prohibiting chickens on 7,000 sf lots unless they obtain a variance, or should ZBA hear a special permit application? Ms. Friedman suggests prohibited unless they obtain a variance. Mr. Grimshaw agrees.

Ms. Nist stated that legally you must buy 6 chickens. Ms. Buck will think about how to word this part of the bylaw to make clearer. Ms. Nist reiterated that you must buy 6 chickens; to purchase fewer than 6 chickens would be illegal.

Ms. Cooper asked who would enforce the bylaw. Ms. Buck said the Zoning Enforcement Officer if violating the Zoning Bylaw. Mr. Cooper asked what if it's just about having bird's not about stench and so on. Ms. Friedman if there is no license obtained then the Zoning Enforcement Officer would be the one to pursue the situation.

Ms Cooper asked about the people selling eggs but are not a business. Ms. Friedman stated that Board of Health would deal with that issue. Mr. Grimshaw agreed.

Ms. Cooper stated it was clarified in the amendment so she was curious. Ms Buck asked if sales should be allowed by special permit. Ms. Friedman thinks that if you're going to sell products such as eggs, then you've entered a whole new stage.

Ms. Buck then asked if Ms. Friedman's intent was to prohibit egg sales, or allow a special permit. Ms. Friedman stated that you have to be licensed by the Board of Health, so it is prohibited without the necessary licensing, and reiterates that you cannot sell eggs without license. Ms. Buck clarifies and states that you are allowed this by-right process if you are not selling eggs. Ms. Friedman stated if someone wants to sell their eggs they can, but they should pay \$175 fee for the special permit and would have to have inspections by Board of Health.

Ms. Cooper added that egg cartons must be approved and properly date stamped. Mr. Kularski said if we are going to let people sell eggs then it takes the objective away from bylaw.

Mr. Brooks wanted to know why the Animal Control Officer wasn't at the meeting, and why is it that there hasn't been much done to enforce problems with chickens. Ms. Nist states that this is a Zoning Bylaw and the Animal Control Officer is under the General Bylaw.

Mr. Brooks asked what the license is for? Ms. Buck clarified the purpose of permit is to keep track of chickens for health reasons. Mr. Kularski added that the purpose of permitting is also to give guidelines and information to people keeping chickens. Ms. Friedman stated the vision was that the Board of Health and Agriculture Commission would come up with a link online or provide a handout for owners especially the ones who don't have the experience.

Ms. Buck suggested that she speak with the Animal Control Officer to discuss enforcement options.

Mr. Brooks suggests that if you have chickens and you don't have the necessary license then they should get a fine. Ms. Buck said we may not be able to address fines directly in the Zoning Bylaw but possibly in the General Bylaw, or regulations

Ms. Friedman asked if the Zoning Enforcement Officer could delegate to Animal Control? Legally it comes under the Zoning Enforcement Officer because it's a Zoning Bylaw, but she wonders if they can delegate. Ms. Buck said she'd look into it.

Mr. Brooks understands that the licenses will not be as much revenue as dogs but wanted to know what that money will go to. Ms Friedman states that it'll cover the cost of licensing. Ms. Buck added that the money would go to the General fund, and the current draft is a \$10 yearly fee.

Ms. Buck noted that the deadline to submit amendments has been extended to 9/17/2018, so the zoning hearings can be continued to September 11, 2018.

Solar Moratorium

Ms. Buck stated the town is interested in temporary moratorium to research the issues of solar farms, and better develop amendments related to this use. The intent is to pull the other draft solar article and continue working on it during the moratorium period. At the previous meeting there were concerns that a temporary solar moratorium would affect our designation as a Green Community. She reached out to the Central Massachusetts Green Community representative, Kelly Brown, and she said that we would be fine with a 6 month moratorium. She'd researched

this issue when Charlton proposed their moratorium. Leicester far exceeds the requirements to be considered a Green Community, so as long as we continue to meet the Green Community base standards we are good with amendments purposed. Ms. Buck continued onto the “grandfathering” issue. The way state law works for zoning changes and commercial uses are only exempt if you have special permit approval or building permit in hand prior to the date of the first hearing notice went in the newspaper. We currently have two applications in: 515 Henshaw (site plan review) and Mulberry St (special permit). They both still have open hearings but they are not exempt from the proposed bylaw. Ms. Buck asked what Board members’ thoughts were on including language in the bylaw about exempting projects under review.

Ms. Friedman suggested that anything that is already under review with an open hearing should be grandfathered. Any other applications that come after or has no hearing should not be grandfathered. Other Board members agreed.

Solar Bylaw Changes

Ms. Buck noted that the intent is not go forward with this article, but suggests that we keep hearing open until 9/11/2018 to allow Town Counsel to review the moratorium language.

Residential Dimensional Requirements

Ms. Buck stated the initial draft changes included the SA and R1 district, and that she was asked to revise the proposal so only R1 would be modified. She asked what size we should propose.

Ms. Friedman pointed out the biggest debate was about the SA district. Mr. Grimshaw agreed but had thought we moved past that part. Ms. Friedman added that we continued this for the public so anyone with any opinion or concern could express it at the meeting. Ms. Friedman stated that at the last meeting we had talked about changing the frontage.

Mr. Grimshaw wanted to go back to talking about the SA district, and mentioned Mr Kularski had strong feelings about maintaining what is already in the SA district. Mr. Kularski agreed and stated that just because there are larger house being built in the SA district and then when they build they have to have larger setbacks because of septic.

Mr. Grimshaw asked if there is any opposition to Mr. Kularski’s concern. Ms. Friedman reiterates that because there are options for developers, such as Open Space Residential Development (OSRD), for smaller lots and for narrower streets she thinks it makes sense to leave the draft the way it is but encourage people to use the OSRD bylaw, because there are fewer roads to take care of and it maintains rural character.

Mr. Grimshaw asked if there were any questions or concerns on and added we leave SA as is and continued onto R1.

Ms. Nist liked Mr. Kularski suggestion that if they don’t have access to water and sewer it should be 50,000s.f. and 20,000s.f. if there is access. Mr. Kularski stated that not even water and sewer, just sewer. Ms. Friedman added that if they have sewer they have water.

Ms. Buck wanted to clarify that we want to modify R1 district to a minimum 20,000s.f. with 125’ of frontage if there is access to water and sewer; and a minimum of 50,000s.f. if there is no water or sewer. Board members agreed. Mr. Grimshaw stated that the septic system is causing this lot size issues.

Mr. Brooks asked what the minimum square footage was before the population was getting to high for R1. Ms Buck said that both R1 and SA were changed, but previously R1 was 20,000 s.f.

Mr. Brooks stated that we raised the square footage for population reasons not because of septic. He feels that the Board is just trying to make the Town Administrator happy, but it's causing Ms. Buck a lot of work to not achieve anything. If he had a small lot with a 2 bedroom house with a septic system he should be able to do so but he wouldn't be able to because we wouldn't allow it because of the restrictions regarding the SA district.

Mr. Grimshaw states that other towns are just as strict with their regulations. Ms. Friedman agreed.

Mr. Brooks stated that the surrounding towns' communities grew and they have had to slow things down. Leicester has decline school enrollment will lose a full class in about 10 years. He added that people do not need mansions. Ms. Friedman added that the OSRD bylaw is an option.

Vehicle Related Use

Ms. Buck stated that the way the bylaw is written now there is inconsistency between the zoning districts, and we have had disputes over issues like whether or not gas stations allow auto repair. The purpose is to clarify those issues and create several new auto-related uses and define them. She modified the proposal so that the threshold between the two categories of auto sales was 30 cars (previously 40).

Ms. Nist asked if taxi or limousine service would include Uber. Ms. Buck said she would work on the definition so that it does not capture Uber as a taxi. The intent is not to stop someone with their ordinary car. She noted the footnote stating that display or parking of vehicles is prohibited in road rights-of-way and in required landscape buffer areas, and that Site Plan Review is required for more than 10 spaces.

Ms. Buck asked about the RIB district (which vehicle-related uses should be allowed by-right vs. special permit. The Board went through each use and made amendments to the proposal. Uses allowed by right in HB-1 & 2 would also be allowed by-right in RIB.

Ms. Buck noted that vehicle-related uses are proposed to be prohibited in the NB district.

Breweries, Wineries, Distilleries

Ms. Buck noted that she'd amended the definition based on discussion at the last meeting, so that it would be more restrictive in the SA district. She asked if the Board wanted it even more restrictive, such as limiting to farm licensees. Board member consensus was to leave as currently proposed.

Ms. Buck asked about the Board's preferences in NB. If we leave the draft as is, this use would be allowed by special permit. Board members agreed to leave as is.

MOTION: Ms. Friedman moved to continue the hearing to September 11, 2018 at 7:00PM.

SECOND: Ms. Nist.

VOTE: All in favor.

Approval of Minutes:

Ms. Nist said minutes were excellent but pointed out some grammatical and typographical errors.

MOTION: Mr. Kularski moved to approve the minutes of August 7, 2018 with the corrections discussed.

SECOND: Ms. Nist.

VOTE: All in favor

Town Planner Report/General Discussion:

Abutter Notification

Ms. Buck suggested changing procedures to allow applicants to use Certificates of Mailing, rather than Certified Mail Return Receipt, as Certificates of Mailing are considerably less expensive and easier for applicants. Longer-term, the Board should amend its Regulations to allow this, but the Board could vote to waive this requirement in the meantime. There was discussion back and forth on the issue. Ms. Friedman was concerned that we wouldn't have proof that abutters received notice. Ms. Buck noted that state law allows regular mail.

MOTION: Ms. Friedman move to waive Certified Mail for abutter notification, but require Certificates of Mailing.

SECOND: Mr. Kularski. Discussion: Ms. Friedman noted that the Board could still require Certified Mail in certain large projects.

VOTE: All in favor

Clothing Boxes

Ms. Friedman asked about regulation of clothing donation boxes. Mr. Brooks noted these were permitted by the Select Board. If there's a problem, applicants are asked to clean up right away or they'll lose license.

Municipal Vulnerability preparedness Grant

Ms. Buck noted that Town received this grant and she'll be working with the consultants [Fuss & O'Neil] on grant implementation.

MOTION: Ms. Friedman moved to adjourn.

SECOND: Ms. Nist.

VOTE: All in favor

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted:

Michelle Buck, Town Planner

Documents included in meeting packet:

- Agenda
- Memo from Town Planner to the Planning Board dated 8/2/2018 regarding 8/7/2018 meeting
- Site Plan Review and Special Permit application and related documents for Mulberry Street Solar Farm
- Letter to Mr. Grimshaw dated 8/8/2018 and one Planning Board dated 8/13/2018 regarding 101 Huntoon Memorial Highway project Narrative, response to comments and Order Of Condition Draft
- Zoning Bylaw Amendment Draft dated 8/2/2018 regarding Chickens
- Zoning Bylaw Amendment Draft dated 8/2/2018 regarding Solar Farm Moratorium Draft
- Zoning Bylaw Amendment Draft dated 8/1/2018 regarding Ground-Mounted Solar Energy System Bylaw Improvements
- Zoning Bylaw Amendment Draft dated 8/15/2018 regarding Residential Dimensional Requirements
- Zoning Bylaw Amendment Draft dated 8/13/2018 regarding Vehicle Related Uses Draft
- Zoning Bylaw Amendment Draft dated 8/15/2018 regarding Breweries and Related Uses
- Meeting Minutes dated 8/7/2018

Documents submitted at meeting:

- Memo from Kevin Quinn