



Town of Danvers
Planning Board

Danvers Town Hall
One Sylvan Street
Danvers, MA 01923
www.danvers.govoffice.com

Planning Board Members:

Margaret J. Zilinsky, Chair
Kristine Cheetham
James Sears
Aaron Henry
William Prentiss
John Farmer, Associate

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING
Daniel J. Toomey Hearing Room
September 12, 2017
7:00 p.m.
MINUTES

Kristine Cheetham called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Planning Board members James Sears, Aaron Henry and William Prentiss were present. Planning and Human Services Director Karen Nelson was also present.

OTHER MATTERS

301 Newbury Street. Request for a Minor Modification to an approved Site Plan pursuant to Section 4 of the Zoning Bylaw submitted by Morgan Memorial Goodwill Industries for property located in the Highway Corridor Zoning District. The applicant proposes to remodel and occupy the northwest end space of the building totaling approximately 12,137 square feet. (Assessor's Map 19, Lot 8) (*SPA action date: September 19, 2017*)

Greg Sullivan, from Slateblue Design, appeared before the Board. He stated that there were interior renovations being done to the site along with some signage changes. They will be doing work to the back of the store. There will be directional signage to drop off donations to the back. Goodwill has had a history of people dropping things at the front door, and they want to make it clear that the drop-off is in the back.

There is a bell like a garage filling station that will ring to let the staff know that someone has pulled up to drop off donations. Rolling bins will be filled with donations from cars. The employees will be the only people going in and out from the back. They are adding a compactor to dispose of the recyclable material. The dock area will remain the same. They need an additional egress because of the remoteness of the location. There are metal stairs to let people egress out the back. There will be a screen fence to hide the compactor from view from Conifer Hill Drive. Smaller loads will be brought up the stairs by employees. The larger donations will use the carts.

Prentiss asked about the general condition that the Engineer asked about. Sullivan said that the dotted lines identifies the area that is being repaved.

Cheetham asked how many cars would fit in the queue. Sullivan said that there would be eight cars, four per lane. She asked if the queue would spill into the entry area. Sullivan said that is the reason for the bell system. The drop-off area will be constantly staffed. There will not be a back-up.

Prentiss inquired about their plans for off-hours. Sullivan said they will check the drop-off area every morning. They will be sure that they are there early in the morning to clean up any donations made after hours. Sullivan said that there will be signs not to drop off during off hours.

Cheetham asked if there was signage when you enter the area. Sullivan said that there was no sign; the area would be striped. He said that they did not want signage in front of the building. They have a sign on the awning that will show the donation center.

Henry asked if the "STOP" and "DO NOT ENTER" shown on the plan were pavement markings. Sullivan confirmed this. He said it was a curb cut and is better organized and defined with this.

MOTION: Prentiss read the Certificate of Action and moved to approve the Minor Modification to an Approved Site Plan for 301 Newbury Street. Sears seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

105 and 115 Dayton Street. Request by 115 Dayton St LLC for endorsement of Form A plan to combine two separate lots into one lot. (Assessor's Map 31, Lot 61 & 99). (*Approval Not Required Action Date: September 19, 2017*)

Sears recused himself from the meeting.

Dan Powers, from the Morin-Cameron Group, Inc., appeared before the Board. This plan combines two lots into one.

Prentiss asked where the original two lots were. Powers showed it on the plan.

Nikki Edry, 17 Danielle Drive. Edry said that she was notified by another resident about this ANR plan. She asked to look at the plan. She asked if any easements were created by combining these two lots.

Henry told her that the neighbors will be notified if anything is going to be done with this property.

Nelson said that they have a master email list to forward Planning Board agendas. She told her that her email could be added to the list.

Henry said that procedurally this is an Approval Not Required Plan. They have to approve this because it meets all the guidelines. If there is a part two as to why these lots are being combined, the abutters will be notified.

MOTION: Henry read the Certificate of Action and moved to approve the application for the Approval Not Required for 105 and 115 Dayton Street. Prentiss seconded the motion. The motion passed by a vote of 3-0.

17 (Lot 28) Overlook Drive and 19 (Lot 27) Overlook Drive. Request by Lindallwood Realty III, LLC for endorsement of Form A plan to adjust the lot line between the two lots. (Assessor's Map 45, Lot 199 and 200). (*Approval Not Required Action Date: September 15, 2017*)

Albert Ellis appeared before the Board on behalf of Lindallwood Realty III, LLC. He said that they were doing an ANR plan that was the subject of a Special Permit granted earlier this year to allow for a common driveway. Some attorneys and lenders do not like common driveways, and the buyer of this lot does not like the common drive. They looked at other ways to address this issue. They increased the frontage of 17 Overlook Drive by adding the area shown by a green triangle to 17 Overlook Drive from 19 Overlook Drive. They added the orange triangle from 19 Overlook Drive to 17 Overlook Drive. Maloney wanted to be sure the driveways could be accommodated on each parcel.

Henry asked if they had a slope requirement in Danvers. Ellis said in terms of a driveway, the Town did not.

Henry asked if the Special Permit was recorded, and Ellis responded that it was. This way they will have it if they need to use it.

Sears said that the comments from the Building Inspector had questions concerning the plan itself that have not been addressed. He said that he does not see a before and after.

Nelson said that the driveways were not shown on the lots, but it was sufficient.

Cheetham said that because they are such new lots, the lines are new anyway.

Prentiss asked if the amount of impervious area has changed. Ellis said it went down.

Prentiss asked if the Special Permit and the common driveway cannot be used if they start building. Henry said they have three years to use it. Ellis said that they have not recorded the easements to the common driveway because they do not want them recorded on the plan. If recorded, then it becomes part of the record.

MOTION: Sears read the Certificate of Action and moved to approve the application for an Approval Not Required Plan for 17 Overlook Drive and 19 Overlook Drive. Henry seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

PUBLIC HEARING

85 Newbury Street and 41 Popes Lane. Request for a Major Modification to an approved Site Plan pursuant to Section 4 of the Zoning Bylaw submitted by Lou DiLuigi of DiLuigi Foods for property at 85 Newbury Street and 41 Popes Lane, pursuant to Section 4 of the Zoning Bylaw. Said property is located in the Highway Corridor District. The applicant proposes to construct a 15-foot by 17-foot metal shed (255 square feet) to be used for a new treatment plant designed by Northeast Environmental Laboratory Inc. The proposed shed will be located in front of the existing building at 41 Popes Lane. (Assessor's Map 48, Lot 28B) (*SPA action date: September 15, 2017*)

Kevin Fleming, from Cypress Design, Inc., appeared before the Board. He stated that this is the DiLuigi Food building. They are going to construct a 15 foot by 17 foot shed that is being required by the South Essex Sewage District (SESD) because the ph levels are too low.

This shed will be three feet off the existing building. All the equipment for the required treatment will be in the shed. The water will be treated and go back into the system.

Prentiss asked if this was to improve the water. Fleming said that the testing done by the SESD showed the ph level needed to be raised. It will be monitored.

Arthur Choo, from Choo & Company, Inc., described the shed. He said that the materials would match the existing building.

MOTION: Henry moved to close the public hearing for the Major Modification to Site Plan relative to 85 Newbury Street and 41 Popes Lane. Prentiss seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

MOTION: Prentiss read the Certificate of Action and moved to approve the Major Modification to Site Plan relative to 85 Newbury Street and 41 Popes Lane.

Cheetham questioned whether all previous approvals remained in effect.

MOTION: Prentiss moved to approve the Certificate of Action as amended. Sears seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

39 Clark Street. Request for Site Plan Approval pursuant to Section 4 of the Zoning Bylaw submitted by Ariston Custom Homes, Inc. for property located in the Residential-I Zone District. The applicant proposes to retain the home, demolish the one-story garage and construct a two and one-half story two-family home. (Assessor's Map 42, Lot 32) (*SPA action date: September 18, 2017*) (**Applicant requests to withdraw this application without prejudice**)

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

Proposed zoning amendment for the Maple Street Traditional Neighborhood Development Overlay (40R – Smart Growth District)

In accordance with MGL, CH. 40A, Sec.5 the Planning Board is holding a public hearing regarding the proposed Maple Street Traditional Neighborhood Development (40R-Smart Growth District) overlay zoning language, design standards and zoning map amendments to include parcels in the Industrial-1 District, and limited portions of Commercial-1, Commercial-1A and Residential-1. The overlay is approximately 16.2 acres of land with frontage on the following public and private ways: Maple Street, Hobart Street, Locust Street, North Putnam Street, Maple Avenue, Putnam Court, Butler Court, Butler Avenue, Oak Street and Charter Street.

Text of the proposed zoning language and a map of parcels included in the proposed zoning district is available at www.danversma.gov, Town Clerks Office and Planning Office. **(This hearing has been continued to the Planning Board meeting scheduled for September 26, 2017.)**

4 East Coast Road. Request for Site Plan Approval pursuant to Section 4 of the Zoning Bylaw submitted by Alvelo Enterprises, LLC for property located in the Highway Corridor. The applicant proposes to use this property as a contractor's yard and construct a new 4,400 square foot building to provide office space, together with vehicle and equipment storage. (Assessor's Map 54, Lot 5) (*SPA action date: September 18, 2017*) **(Continued without discussion at the applicant's request to September 26, 2017. Request to extend the action date to September 29, 2017.)**

MOTION: Prentiss moved to continue the application for Site Plan Approval for 4 East Coast Road to September 26, 2017 and extend the action date to September 29, 2017. Henry seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

197 Newbury Street. Request for Site Plan Approval pursuant to Section 4 of the Zoning Bylaw submitted by JD Design d/b/a Signarama for property at 197 Newbury Street located in the Highway Corridor. The applicant proposes to construct a 7,280 square foot building to be occupied by a mixed-use of commercial and light industrial tenants. (Assessor's Map 24, Lot 21B) (*SPA action date: September 15, 2017*) **(Continued without discussion at the applicant's request to September 26, 2017. Request to extend the action date to September 29, 2017.)**

MOTION: Prentiss moved to continue the application for Site Plan Approval for 197 Newbury Street to September 26, 2017 and extend the action date to September 29, 2017. Henry seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

MINUTES

September 5, 2017

MOTION: Sears moved to approve the minutes of September 5, 2017. Prentiss seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

OTHER MATTERS

Review draft zoning initiatives.

Nelson said that it was time to do housekeeping items for the Board to review. It has been a team approach in the office to get the language crafted to move into a legal notice.

Nelson told the Board that she had been talking about a Special Town Meeting to be held on December 11th. She has been advised that the date has been changed to December 4th.

Nelson said that they have been working with the Building Inspector, Rich Maloney, as well.

The first article is for the definition of a Pet Day Care. This has been in the zoning bylaw and somehow dropped off when it was being reprinted.

She stated that typographical errors need to go through a Town Meeting to be corrected.

Nelson told the Board that they have been asked to look at establishing language for the film industry. This is so that filming can take place in a residential district for a few days. It will not be open-ended.

She said that the goal is to acquaint you with these items. This item will remain on the agenda for any questions, thoughts or ideas. If there are no questions or concerns, they can move forward.

Prentiss asked how the Danvers Cable Access Television (DCAT) would be affected by this.

Georgia Wilson said that this is for the definition of film industry.

Sears had a question on the definition of a structure. He asked if they were expanding the language to include a pool. The Board told him that was not correct.

Nelson explained that strike-outs were what was being deleted and underscores were what was being added.

Cheetham said that they needed to add the definition back into the bylaws. It states language about other household pets.

Nelson said they were taking what was already approved to go into the bylaw.

Cheetham felt they may need a notation with an explanation.

Sears felt it might be an opportunity to further define the language. We now have hot tubs and other structures. He felt it might help the building inspector for interpretation. A hot tub is a structure. Is that the subject to a setback requirement?

Nelson said that Maloney would need to answer that. He will be asked to come to a meeting.

Sears said that he has seen a slide to a pool considered a structure. Nelson said that this is something Maloney deals with on a daily basis.

Flood Plain Districts and Floodways – Definitions

Wilson said that this amendment updates the definitions for the national flood insurance program. The underlined text is the new language.

Cheetham asked if this was different from what was adopted a few years ago.

Nelson said the underline is the new text being added by the flood insurance program.

Wilson said that they updated all the sections, but they forgot to delete the old section. They are proposing to delete sections 31.1 through 31.8.

Henry asked why there were not putting these into one article.

Nelson said that they would combine it into one paragraph.

35.6 Special Exceptions

Wilson said that this was the same language as in Section 30, Special Permit. They are proposing to delete the paragraph because it is repetitive.

Nelson said that there is no such thing as a special exception. This is a dilemma for the building inspector's office.

Henry asked if they could just delete this language since 30.2.17 says the same thing. Wilson said that 35.6 is specific to signage. Henry confirmed that we are going to say to refer to 30.2.17 and follow those procedures.

Nelson said that this is cleaner.

Prentiss asked if it could be interpreted as a lower level of using a special permit as written. The response was no.

Site Plan Approval

Nelson said that they looked how best to craft the removals for spelling errors. We are striking out and adding a letter.

Henry asked if these articles could be grouped together. The whole article revolves around typographical errors. He felt it would be easier to just call the article typographical errors.

Cheetham felt this would not trigger questions.

Film Industry

Wilson said that the film industry use would fall under accessory uses under Section 9. Making a new section (h) to allow film industry use in a residential area for up to 14 days. Abutters within 300 feet of the property being used would be notified.

Nelson said they mirrored the language in Section 1.2, 3 (b). They would hold a public meeting similar to what they do for intersection improvements. Putting it on the Town to involve the neighborhood if something like this was to come forward. It is not a trigger for a required public hearing.

Henry asked what were the neighbors' rights if they were invited and objected. Henry asked what if it goes south, and the Town Manager wants to do it. What are my rights as an abutter to appeal an accessory use? You are appealing the Building Inspector's determination. They are not applying for anything; it is a determination.

Cheetham asked if they have event permits.

Henry said he felt this was licensing.

Prentiss pointed out that storage units are temporary.

Nelson said that they could talk to Town Counsel. They are also talking to other communities.

Henry felt it was more a licensing issue than a zoning issue.

Prentiss asked Diane Langlais, Selectman, in the audience if the Selectmen have discussed this.

Langlais said that she was here to listen. She said that this Board is asking the same questions they are asking.

Prentiss wondered if the Town Manager was the right person to approve this.

Henry said they need to think about this if it breaks down.

Nelson felt where it said Town Manager, or his designee, it would mean that body that would be most likely in the position to gain the public input. It could be the Board of Selectmen.

Cheetham asked about the movie that was filmed at St. John's Prep. Langlais pointed out that it was not on Town-owned property.

Sears said that the language was "single or two-family structure." He asked why it would be limited to those types of homes.

Nelson said that the present definition forbids filming to happen.

Wilson said that the Building Inspector can approve filming in a commercial-use building.

Sears asked what would happen if there was a request for a four-family dwelling.

Wilson said that they would need to speak to the Building Inspector about this.

Henry asked if this could be put under residential in general.

Wilson said that they need to define residential.

Henry wanted to make it clear that the Board supports the thrust of the article. We are just questioning the language.

Langlais said the reason the Selectmen said no to the movie that wanted to come to Town was that it was not allowed in a residential area. There were going to be vehicles on the roadway. She asked them to stop defining it because it causes a problem if something is left out of the definition. She suggested bringing it into the whole Town. She felt that whoever the regulatory Board is decides if it is appropriate with the neighbors and the abutters.

Cheetham said that no matter where this use occurs, there are impacts that go along with it, which goes back to your process of the permit.

Henry asked if the zoning could say that it is allowed. This is an activity that could be licensed. Could the license worry about these technicalities? This Board cannot do site plan review of a movie set.

Wilson said that she called the state filming office for a formal definition. It was mentioned that some local towns have movie licenses. Filming could fall under home occupation, and a lot of the guidelines in home occupation could be used in film industry like hours of operation. We could mirror the requirements for an accessory use that set out hours of operation.

Henry felt if it was an accessory use, it might be hard for zoning to deal with this.

Cheetham said that they have special event licenses like for a festival at the mall.

Sears pointed out that there was language in C-III because we were anticipating that. This is not an accessory use.

Cheetham asked Wilson to look on listserv. Nelson said that they had done this.

Cheetham said that Manchester-by-the-Sea just did a film. Wilson said that they do it, but it is not done by zoning.

Sears read the definition for accessory use.

Henry said we need to be sure it can happen anywhere in Town, but there is a license.

Cheetham felt they could set up the license with certain criteria that needed to be followed.

Nelson asked if this would go into the general Town Bylaw.

Sears said that you could have a very large non-profit entity that is filming.

Henry said that they need to be careful that the language is not too broad.

Henry felt that there needs to be a piece of this in the zoning to clear it up. Henry wants to be clear that he felt this was a licensing issue, but it needed to be cleared through zoning so the license can happen.

Wilson said there are numerous licensing templates from other towns.

Nelson said that they would go back to the Building Inspector for the clearest way to allow this.

Maple Street

Sears said that he had a question from the first meeting regarding reducing the height to 45 feet and the reduction in the number of units. This would result in a drop in the amount of money that the Town received. He felt it was important that they know these numbers.

Nelson said that Ted Brovitz was coming back for the Planning Board meeting of September 26th.

Sears asked if this would be the final crafting of the bylaw before going to the Finance Committee.

Nelson said that this would be a discussion on September 26th.

Henry said that if Brovitz had that information, we should be able to make that call that night.

Car Dealerships.

Henry felt this needed to be explained better. They are being allowed by use variance and findings. The explanation needs to be clearer.

Cheetham confirmed that this was a transfer from zoning to planning.

Nelson said that we have had new site plans that have come in where they are knocking down, rebuilding and reconfiguring on Route 114. It makes sense to have that dialogue at the Planning Board level. Abutters would not have to come out to two meetings.

Sears felt it was confusing as written.

Henry felt since we already had car dealerships, more of an explanation would be needed.

Cheetham said it would be helpful if there was a statement from the Zoning Board of Appeals that they are in agreement.

Henry said that the ZBA is good at hardship, and the Planning Board is good at site plan review.

Sears felt if there was a copy of the table of uses it would help people understand it.

Prentiss asked the difference of Route 114-A and Route 114-B. Cheetham said the difference is that Route 114-B has housing. It is the mix of housing and industrial uses.

Accessory Uses.

Nelson said that they are trying to combine this into one article.

Sears said that when you read it there seems to be a reduction. He felt it was more stringent.

Sears said that this bylaw was passed within the last 10 years, and now they are making it harder. He did not feel that they could call it a grammatical change.

Nelson asked if it was a concern of the Board if it went to three, or did you prefer to leave it at two.

Sears felt that they would need a vote from Town Meeting.

Henry said that they could go to Town Meeting and felt that more than two is three. Therefore, they could call it a grammatical change.

Henry did not have a problem lowering it to two. He agreed with Sears that this should not be shown as a grammatical change.

Nelson said that when storage containers are used on a long-term basis, it negates the property owner from acknowledging that they have outgrown the property or are not putting the addition investment that they need to do.

Henry said that the first six years he was on the Board, for approximately three years there were containers on Dayton Street and Center Street. He does not mind the language getting stricter.

Nelson asked what was the will of the Board.

Cheetham asked if they were looking to change it grammatically, why not change the number to three.

Henry said that they want to get clarification. They want to get the language consistent with the enforcement.

Nelson asked if this was something you wanted to pursue, or is the language fine.

Sears said that he would like to see less. It would have to go through as a separate article change.

Table of Allowable Uses

Wilson said that the next change that correlates with the footnotes in the back of the book numbered 1-18. They are proposing to change 1, 2, 4 and 18.

Wilson pointed out the incorrect footnotes in the table.

Sears felt this was confusing at it was set forth. He said that the tables needed to be shown to clarify it.

A discussion ensued regarding what was being deleted.

Nelson said that they will have another Town Meeting related to zoning efforts. She is looking for a practical approach to what the Board wants the undertake, since with the Maple Street rezoning effort, this Board has invested a significant amount of time. She would like the Board's input of what they should attempt to do at this Town Meeting.

Cheetham felt it would help people to understand if the tables were highlighted with color.

Sears said that at workshops they have slides. At Town Meeting they do not have slides. He felt it was not important.

Nelson suggested going through this and then go back to the Building Inspector with the Board's comments.

Wilson said that they want to add a height requirement of 35 feet, 3 stories since presently there is no height requirement in the C-1A District.

Cheetham felt this was more than a typographical error, and there may be a debate whether the height should be 40 or 45 feet. She asked staff to find out what the average height is in the district now.

Multi-family Affordability Provision.

Nelson explained that this was brought forward through the Danvers Affordable Housing Trust. It is addressing a loophole for multi-residential developments. Under applicability, the language now states developments of five units or more. It would be changed to developments for a total of 5 units or more, new or existing units. Under requirements, the change would be the net number of units added would be at a prorated basis that would be \$10,000 per unit for the rental developments.

Cheetham asked what it meant when it said five or more. Nelson explained that if there is a project where there is an existing single-family home and four townhouses, the original single-family home is not counted.

Sears said that this would close a loophole. Developers do not count the existing homes.

Henry said that this would flush this bullet point out. He felt they should explain how many projects were developed that skirted the issue of offering an affordable unit.

Nelson said that it has been an issue regarding the existing unit.

Marijuana Establishments.

Nelson said that the proposal is a template of what was received from legal counsel. Nelson said that they have included two locations. They would do an overlay over the existing overlay. They would mirror the same map and lot numbers that are currently being used for the medical marijuana locations.

Cheetham asked if there was an opportunity in this process to delete one area, Cherry Hill.

Cheetham asked if they had the opportunity to ask Town Meeting if they want to ban it outright.

Nelson said that they did ask Town Counsel about the two locations. She felt that doing recreational marijuana in one location would not be considered spot zoning, but could not guarantee it. She suggested getting both locations into the zoning.

Cheetham would not be concerned about spot zoning.

Henry felt it would be wise to go broader because it cannot be added back in.

Langlais said that the legislature has tied the Town's hands. She wanted it to go back to ballot. The five Selectmen are going to vote and decide if it is legal in Danvers. This is dangerous because the medical marijuana people could come back and say by right they can sell retail.

Langlais told the Board that allowing the overlay on the medical marijuana, you are protecting the Town for later. She said this is why it is so important that we need the zoning to protect the Town.

Cheetham said that this will create debate on Town Meeting floor.

Langlais said that hopefully the Selectmen will have voted prior to the Town Meeting.

Henry thought they would need to have a referendum.

Langlais wanted that to happen, but that is not the case.

Henry asked why the article was necessary if they wanted to ban it.

Langlais said that they are confident that the yes group will appeal to the state. If that happened, they would not have anything in place for zoning.

Henry said that the Attorney General's Office has said that they are not sure if you need zoning if you are prohibiting it.

Langlais said that the Town's legal counsel is telling them that they should have this in place to protect themselves from the unknown.

Cheetham said that if they do a general prohibition as a community, you do not need it. It is allowed on the books with restrictions.

Henry asked why the Town would want this if they are trying to prohibit it.

Langlais said she was not sure how the five selectmen were going to vote.

A discussion ensued regarding recreational marijuana.

Cheetham said that as a Planning Board member, it would be helpful if they had a primer where we could read the determination to understand it better.

Zoning Bylaw Various

Nelson explained that these were all typographical errors.

Nelson said that under Section 30.4 – Provisions for Special Permits. They need to change the Town's bylaw to regarding a Special Permit being good for three years instead of two years.

Wilson said that Section 33.4.7 – Requirements for Open Space. This was more a grammatical change.

Sears asked if they can have the changes broken down into three categories. Could they have typographical errors, state law required changes and substantive changes? He felt this would be easier.

Zoning Map: 471 & 469 Maple Street

Nelson explained that this is a small triangle of land at the base of Danvers Hospital. There is residence, state-owned land and town-owned land.

Cheetham felt that they would need a map, and the frontage would need to be defined.

Nelson felt that this would allow an opportunity for redevelopment.

Cheetham confirmed that this was private and town-owned land. She felt someone would raise the question whether someone should sell that parcel of town-owned land.

Nelson said that a portion of that land would be of some use to an abutter.

Cheetham felt this was the type of thing that would be heavily debated at Town Meeting.

Henry felt if some articles fall out of this initiative, it may be worth taking the articles that fell out and forwarding them to the Selectmen and Finance Committee to show them they have been discussing these items. These are changes that are annoyances, but they need to be addressed.

Establishment of Districts

Nelson said that this was to add the overlay districts to the existing established zoning districts.

Henry felt this should be folded into the individual articles.

BRIEFING

Planning staff and chair will update the Board of various items of interest. This agenda item may include requests to set public hearing and workshop dates, sign plans, informal discussion regarding future projects and current projects under construction.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Prentiss moved to adjourn. Sears seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

The meeting adjourned at: 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted: Francine T. Butler

The Planning Board approved these minutes on October 24, 2017.