



# *Town of Southwick*

## **Planning Board**

### MINUTES



**Tuesday, September 21, 2021**

**MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Michael Doherty, Chair  
Marcus Phelps, Vice Chair  
Richard Utzinger [via Zoom]  
David Sutton  
David Spina  
Jessica Thornton, Associate  
Jon Goddard, Town Planner

**ABSENT:** None

A regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Board was scheduled using a hybrid format and was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Mr. Doherty. He stated that the meeting was being recorded and asked if anyone in the audience was recording the meeting. Attending the meeting were 26 individuals in-person and additional attendants via Zoom.

**PLANNER'S REPORT:** 7:00 p.m.

1. Mr. Goddard discussed his coordination efforts related to Master Plan Advisory Committee nominations with the Select Board.
2. Mr. Goddard received calls from and met with numerous residents about the Greens-West subdivision and Wynnfield Condominiums regarding the proposed changes to the Greens-West subdivision to be heard later this evening.
3. Mr. Goddard shared upcoming Planning Board dates with an Attorney representing a proposed marijuana facility.
4. Mr. Goddard fielded inquiries and shared zoning information with an individual looking at the former Waterman Farm property at 83 College Highway.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** 7:05 p.m.

1. Mr. Doherty read a draft letter to be submitted by the Town Planner to the Select Board that generally stated: *On behalf of the Southwick Planning Board, I am writing to request that the Select Board authorize adding a potential Article to the Warrant for the next Town Meeting to consider amending the Wireless Communication Services District Bylaw 185-23.1. It was recently brought before and discussed with the Planning Board the potential inadequacies of the existing overlay district map and bylaw, necessitating a revision to the bylaw. Please call if you have any questions or concerns...*

Mr. Doherty said he would send the letter to the Select Board so they could start the process get that logistic done. Mr. Phelps added that there was an advertisement in the Westfield Evening News that day about this for a hearing and Mr. Doherty explained that under certain circumstances we would hold a hearing and then vote to put this on Town Warrant but this is just to ask the Select Board to authorize adding this potential Bylaw to the next Town Meeting.

**APPOINTMENTS:**

**7:10 p.m.      The Greens of Southwick-West Division (land f/k/a 739, 767, & 771 College Highway in the Res. 40 Zone) – Public Hearing**

*Proposed Modifications to a Special Permit,  
Site Plan Approval, & Definitive Subdivision*

---

Mr. Doherty read the legal advertisement for this public hearing and introduced Filipe Cravo of R Levesque Associates, Inc. who was representing the Application for Fiore Realty Holdings LLC. He said that the application was prepared to modify some of the lots on the property and the access to the open space on Lot 7. He went on to explain that the application included modifying what was previously shown as Lots 23 and 24 by combining those two lots and cutting off a piece identified as “Parcel A” to be transferred to an adjacent landowner. The second item he noted was a proposed change for access to Lot 20, providing access from College Highway rather than from Sawgrass Lane via a previously approved shared driveway. This change would also incorporate the removal of a portion of the 50’-wide buffer strip along College Highway. The last item for discussion was a change to how the open space access easement would be depicted in the field on the ground, where the permitted condition of a 10’-wide stone pathway is proposed to be exchanged for lawn area with boulders to delineate the access. He showed the plans with the changes and Mr. Doherty shared them online for Zoom attendees.

Mr. Doherty said that the Southwick Police had not offered a comment on this application because the person who would respond had to recuse himself. He also noted Chief Anderson of the Fire Department had no problem with the project as well as the Town Building Inspector. Mr. Doherty read the comments by the DPW Director, Randy Brown one of which was regarding the

flow direction of stormwater and groundwater at Lot 7, maintenance responsibilities for the easement area, and potential landscape berms. Mr. Cravo said they discussed adding 2- to 3-foot diameter boulders every 50 feet to create markers down the easement to delineate the Open Space access. He also said the maintenance of the grass would be the responsibility of maintained by the Homeowners Association (HOA). Mr. Doherty asked Mr. Cravo about the drainage matters at Lot 7 and he responded that this was something that should be reviewed by the Zoning Enforcement Officer for compliance with the site plan, as it was not part of the Definitive Subdivision; if there are drainage concerns, they would be addressed but they are not tied to the Permit decision of the Definitive Subdivision. Mrs. Thornton stated that it was part of the original yard drain issues initially and Mr. Cravo said that was the solution given to the Homeowner land-owner as a possibility to rectify it. Mr. Cravo explained that the natural topography of the land graded down and there was some sloping that would occur and water would slope flow down as well. Mr. Fiore interjected that the water issue was a pre-existing condition. Mr. Doherty asked if the proposal was to put in a private drain line and Mr. Fiore confirmed that they had.

Mr. Doherty asked about utility service for Lot 20 and Mr. Cravo confirmed that they did add a water service connection to the lot on College Highway as well as a curb cut to College Highway – similar to the existing curb cut that serviced the previous clubhouse for the golf course. Mr. Cravo said that Lot 20 would no longer have the 50'-wide planted buffer along the frontage to College Highway. Mr. Spina asked about the width of the boulders and Mr. Cravo said the total easement is 20 feet wide and they will be using 2-3 foot boulders placement, located along the property sideline and along a parallel line 10 feet away (within the easement area), and installed at 50-foot intervals. Mr. Brown offered to clarify his comment regarding the swale design at Lot 7; he noted that he wasn't opposed to the change but observed that the property owner had taken it upon himself to install a swale behind the property, which in turn directed surface drainage across property of Darlene Dargon and towards open space. He noted that he had met with Ms. Dargon and that she seemed to be OK okay with the current solution. Chris Pratt, Chair for the Conservation Commission, asked about the maintenance burden for the boulders on the path and how they could be maintained if they are only 10 feet apart; instead, it was suggested that the boulders just be located on the property line. Mr. Doherty stated that the easement was never meant to be fully graveled and Mr. Pratt said that a 10 foot gravel path doesn't need much maintenance but it will without gravel. Mr. Phelps interjected that it is going to be grass. Mr. Doherty added there is a similar one on Lauren Lane with an access path and whoever owns the property mows it but technically it's covered by the homeowners association.

Mr. Foster Kerrison of 16 Sawgrass Lane commented that they did not receive a copy of the plans as he thought were promised at a previous meeting. He expressed concern about the water flowing into the street from Lot 7 and it being re-directed behind Lot 8. He shared his opinion that the subdivision had a design defect in that there was no manhole cover at the end of the street as he sees in other subdivisions. He also expressed concern that the easement appeared on their property without their knowledge and asked about certain details for the proposed easement delineation by boulders. Mr. Kerrison also pointed out that the homeowners association would be responsible for maintaining the easement area and remained concerned that the homeowners

were not being consulted for the proposed changes. Mr. Doherty stated that the Board is just considering the change from the existing plan which has a 10'-wide gravel path going 450 feet through the easement area, or to not put the gravel path in but put boulders in every 10 feet – the option to not provide some sort of indication for the easement was not part of the request. Mr. Doherty asked Ms. Dargon, the owner of Lot 8, what she preferred for a solution; she responded that she prefers the boulders with the first boulder placed on the property line. Mr. Kerrison repeated his concern that they were not aware of this easement and that it was not shown on the “original” plans. Ms. Dargon said that the easement was put in later in an addendum. Mr. Doherty noted that when the residential development was approved, the easement was indeed shown on the plans and approved as such. Mr. Goddard suggested that perhaps the difference in perspective arose from the transition from a preliminary to a definitive subdivision plan. Mr. Cravo noted that no lots were sold at that preliminary level but explained the details and changes that are typically implemented as a subdivision transitions from preliminary to definitive. Mr. Doherty noted that the Board was willing to look at solutions but reminded Ms. Dargon that when she purchased her property there was an approved plan and conditions that reflected a 10'-wide gravel path on that property. Ms. Dargon said that she was told that there would be a path along the property line but not that it would be a 20'-wide area on her property; Mr. Kerrison echoed this point.

Joe Fournier of 8 Sawgrass Lane said that his interest in this was when he became involved with the HOA. He noted that upon purchasing property in this development, homeowners become part owner of 32 acres of Open Space and the care of it. He feels the property owners were misinformed about the changes happening to this parcel and were not notified by the Town; he worries about what expenses the HOA will incur with the upkeep of this space. He would also like them to stake out the site where boulders will be going and allow the residents to approve of them. Mr. Fournier also wants to know who will take care of the berms by 10/202 along College Highway and mowing around it and also asked about a streetlight and when it would be turned on. Mr. Fournier noted that the planted buffers to along College Highway were not part of the HOA responsibilities, were not installed per plan, and asked who would be maintaining those areas. Mr. Doherty opined that it would be the individual lot owner's responsibility.

Trudy Chianciola of 17 Sawgrass Lane shared her opinion that the water drainage issue from Lot 7 into the cul-de-sac was a flaw in the original plan which has since caused issues for the development and developer. She was also concerned that the incomplete items should be addressed before approving a change to the development and noted that the homeowners had submitted a letter supporting a change to move the open space access off Lot 8.

Bob Stevens of 33 Tannery Road asked if the Planning Board granted the developer certain points for the subdivision based on “preserving scenic byways” as related to the change for Lot 20. Mr. Cravo confirmed that points were calculated as a Flexible Residential Subdivision under the original submittal; these were recalculated to reflect this change and were still above the required threshold for the development.

Mr. Doherty asked the developer to flag out the boulder locations and said this hearing would need to be continued.

*A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Phelps and **SECONDED** by Mr. Utzinger to continue the public hearing for the Greens of Southwick-West Division permit and definitive plan modifications to Tuesday, October 5, 2021 at 8:00 p.m.*

***Roll call vote:***

<i>Mr. Doherty, yes</i>	<i>Mr. Phelps, yes</i>	<i>Mr. Utzinger, yes</i>	<i>Mr. Sutton, yes</i>
<i>Mr. Spina, yes</i>	<i>Mrs. Thornton, yes</i>		

*The motion passed by unanimous vote.*

**7:20 p.m. 125 Sheep Pasture Road (Res. 40 Zone) – Public Hearing**

*Application for an Estate Lot Special Permit,  
Stormwater Management Permit, & Site Plan Approval*

---

Mr. Doherty read the legal advertisement for this public hearing and welcomed Filipe Cravo to speak on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Cravo described the property's location and described the proposal as an estate lot to be created from an existing parcel. The work will involve a new curb cut and a driveway that will utilize an existing stream crossing. The driveway will access a proposed residence within interior portions of the property, and check dams will be installed along the driveway to manage runoff before depositing the runoff into a stormwater basin. Mr. Cravo mentioned review comments received from DPW and noted that the plans were recently revised; Mr. Brown, the DPW director, had not been given the opportunity to review the revised plans or response letter yet. Ms. Thornton asked if the project had received approval from the Conservation Commission at this point, and Mr. Cravo responded no, it had not. Mr. Doherty noted that the project would be continued accordingly but proceeded with reading comments from Town departments. Mr. Doherty stated no comments from police, no concerns from Chief Anderson from SFD, nothing from the building inspector, and the receipt of DPW comments from Mr. Brown. DPW comments included a request to show utility services along the driveway, the need for a meter pit at Sheep Pasture Road, changing the driveway width to a min. of 15', acknowledgement of requested waivers but a request to provide detail for the bioretention basin, greater detail on erosion/sedimentation control, a sediment forebay, and the submittal of a long-term O&M Operation and Maintenance manual for the stormwater system. Mr. Brown also noted that the need for a driveway, new water service, and trench permit prior to construction.

Mr. Doherty invited questions from the Planning Board members and Mr. Phelps asked if this project was to extend into the wooded area of the property. Mr. Cravo replied yes and guided the board to the areas/farm roads that were already cleared and where new clearing would need to take place. Mr. Geerken, the applicant, noted that he was only going to clear trees that were necessary to complete the work. Mr. Phelps asked if the driveway was to be paved within 25' of

the right-of-way; Sheep Pasture Road Mr. Cravo did not see that indicated on the plan but acknowledged that the paved apron would be added to the plans.

*A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Phelps and **SECONDED** by Mr. Utzinger to continue the public hearing for the 125 Sheep Pasture Road Stormwater Permit, Site Plan Approval, and Special Permit to Tuesday, October 19, 2021 at 7:10 p.m.*

***Roll call vote:***

*Mr. Doherty, yes      Mr. Phelps, yes      Mr. Utzinger, yes      Mr. Sutton, yes*  
*Mr. Spina, yes*

*The motion passed by unanimous vote.*

**7:45 p.m.                      42 Depot Street – Proposed Residential Development  
Continued Public Hearing**

*Special Permit, Site Plan Approval,  
Earth Excavation Special Permit, Wellhead Protection  
District Special Permit, and Stormwater Permit Application*

---

Mr. Phelps recused himself from the matter as an abutter to the project.

Filipe Cravo from R. Levesque Associates, Inc. was in attendance, representing the applicant and application for the continued public hearing for a proposed 100-unit residential development to be located at 42 Depot Street. He stated that revised plans and a response letter to DPW comments had been recently submitted and detailed changes to the stormwater basins and surrounding grades. He also noted that French drains were added to the plans as well as a mail kiosk; no change to the number or location of units was made. Mr. Cravo did reference concerns from Conservation regarding back yard area and proximity to the 50' buffer zone near units 9 & 10. Mr. Cravo mentioned that the project was still being reviewed with Conservation and that Mr. Brown had yet to respond to recently submitted revisions. Mr. Doherty asked if any of the stormwater basin locations had changed; Mr. Cravo said they had not. Mr. Doherty asked about parking next to the mail kiosk and Mr. Cravo responded that there was room for three (3) parallel parking spaces.

Mr. Spina asked about the location of sidewalks near the central green space and suggested that the sidewalk in front of units 72-79 be continued to the intersection with Wildflower Lane to aid pedestrian flow. Mr. Cravo agreed with the suggestion.

Chris Pratt from the Conservation Commission noted the Commission's difficulty with the proximity of units 5-12 to the 50' buffer zone to Bordering Vegetated Wetland and would like to see the buildings moved. He stated that the Commission was not satisfied with markers due to the potential for deterioration over time. Mr. Doherty asked what the specific concern was and



Mr. Pratt responded by noting that only 12' of yard space was shown between the units and the limit of work at the 50' buffer zone limit. Mr. Pratt noted that it was likely to be encroached upon by the residents as a matter of human nature. Mr. Cravo noted that this work was only proposing to clear an additional 25' beyond the existing treeline in this location and that each unit was required to provide a specified area of open and natural space - as calculated in the central and northwest portions of the site.

Ms. Thornton asked if the curvature of the limit of work was defined by the absolute limit of clearing; Mr. Goddard noted that the limit of work was right at the 50' buffer. Ms. Thornton asked if it was permissible to clear in a straight line to alleviate the concern over yard space and Mr. Pratt responded that this was the precise concern that Conservation has about land use over time, such as when a homeowner decides to mow in order to expand lawn area. Mr. Doherty noted that the homeowners would not be mowing their lawns since this was to be a condominium community; Mr. Pratt responded that this was the case today but that a future decision by the homeowners association could result in the same impact – the Conservation Commission was working to be proactive.

Mr. Sutton asked what the Conservation Commission does with other properties that do encroach upon protected areas. Mr. Pratt responded that the Commission works to uphold the same standards as being discussed tonight, such as when they support a variance request. He did acknowledge that movement of the buildings for this project would impact off-street parking and suggested a realignment of Wildflower lane. Mr. Cravo responded by pointing out that the area of work between the building and 50' buffer was to be graded at a 3:1 slope for stormwater management, and then the land would slope downward from the limit of work toward the wetland areas. Mr. Doherty asked if there was any work at the rear of the building, and Mr. Cravo responded that the jogs shown on the buildings were related to interior configurations. Mr. Doherty then acknowledged that this was going to be a matter to be resolved between Conservation and the applicant's team; he then opened up the floor to public comments.

Mr. Bill Malone, 42 Depot Street, suggested using on-site boulders to delineate the limit of work in the subject area since they would not deteriorate over time.

Diane Gale, 5 Point Grove Road, asked if a target price had been stated; Mr. Doherty and Mr. Cravo responded that they were not aware of a number having been stated for the record. Mr. John Pagliaro, one of the applicants for this project, stated that they were still conducting a market analysis.

Beth Capitano, 66 Southview Drive, noted that a previous portion of this public hearing had raised questions about the size and design of buildings nearest Southview Drive. Mr. Cravo turned everyone's attention to an aerial overlay of the project and described the distances from the proposed treeline to Southview Drive. Responding to an inquiry by Mr. Doherty, Mr. Cravo estimated that there was about 60' from Southview Drive to the rail trail, then another 72 feet of vegetation just to the property line of the subject property. Mr. Cravo noted that a significant portion of the site near its easterly boundary was already cleared to near the property line. Ms.

Capitano asked if future clearing might take place; Mr. Doherty noted that if he were to be a resident, he would want the trees to remain. Ms. Capitano continued to reference the traffic study from 2014 and the cited 4,000 vehicle trips cited in that report, mentioning that traffic from these units would be adding to that figure. Mr. Cravo mentioned that the report indicated a “B” level of service at the Depot Street/South Longyard Road/Powder mill intersection, which in his opinion was good. He also noted that the vehicle trips would be distributed throughout the day.

John Pagliaro, co-applicant for this project, asked if there was data regarding homeowner association encroachments into protected areas; Mr. Doherty directed his attention to Conservation for detail on that matter.

Cynthia Marshall, 45 Coes Hill Road, noted that traffic from these units would not only be leaving and coming back – there would be extra trips, such as to support children’s activities. She estimated that 1,000 trips would be generated by this development. Mr. Doherty responded by asking Ms. Marshall to submit any data, if she has any, regarding the number of school children in Southwick condominium complexes. He cited data indicating three (3) school-age children residing at Depot Square. He noted that this data is what informs his opinion about how many children may reside at this development but continued to welcome any data that she had to offer. Ms. Marshall responded by stating that this development did not have the layout or appeal of those at Depot Square, and that the developer should contribute to a traffic signal fund for the adjacent rail trail and street crossing.

Noting the outstanding matter with Conservation, Mr. Cravo expressed the desire to hear any other Planning-related concerns before continuing the public hearing. Mr. Doherty expressed his concern that there was adequate buffer between the development and the rail trail. Mr. Sutton clarified that there was no deck at the rear of units 9-10. Ms. Thornton noted the requested sidewalk connection raised by Mr. Spina. Mr. Doherty then referenced the intersection and traffic concerns, noting that both he and Mr. Goddard were carefully reviewing available options to improve the layout – acknowledging that it was a pre-existing condition and that it could be possible that a problem does not exist. However, surface visibility treatments to draw attention to the vehicular and pedestrian/bicycle areas could be explored.

*A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Sutton and **SECONDED** by Mr. Utzinger to continue the public hearing for 42 Depot Street to Tuesday, October 5, 2021 at 8:30 p.m.*

***Roll call vote:***

*Mr. Doherty, yes                      Mr. Utzinger, yes                      Mr. Sutton, yes                      Mr. Spina, yes*  
*Ms. Thornton, yes*

*The motion passed by unanimous vote.*

8:00 p.m.                      41-51 John Mason Road                      *Special Permit Modification (Decision)*



Mr. Doherty directed the Board's attention to a draft decision that was distributed amongst the members and suggested that they work through the document until they got to conditions that needed to be discussed in great detail. It was noted that Ms. Thornton was designated as a voting member for this application and it should be reflected in the decision as such. Mr. Goddard and board members implemented several minor edits to language that had previously been suggested. Mr. Phelps asked about the inclusion of the term "alcoholic beverages" in item C.3.; the Board, observing that the sale of alcoholic beverages would be regulated by others, decided to state "The applicant may sell alcoholic beverages in addition to food and non-alcoholic beverages from the mobile food establishment if permitted by the licensing authorities." Attorney Day suggested referencing permitting through the Board of Health for the mobile food establishment, but Mr. Doherty indicated that she would see that matter addressed later in the decision. Mr. Doherty suggested that Terms and Conditions item no. 3 should incorporate language pertaining to the mobile food establishment and the necessary permitting effort that the applicant will need to undertake with the Board of Health.

Mr. Spina reflected upon the language suggested by Mr. Phelps in Terms and Conditions item no. number 6, where the opportunity to review the site and operation after a period of time was proposed. Mr. Doherty noted that he did not want to be repeating this hearing every year; he was not opposed to a manageable level of oversight but wanted it to be well-delineated articulated. Mr. Spina observed that this would be a new component to the business and wanted the opportunity to review and ensure that the conditions were being adhered to. Mr. Doherty noted that the permit would have to either expire or have a conditioned review in order to provide the Board with the authority to look back at this application and decision. Mr. Sutton expressed his concern that he did not want the Board to be picking and choosing what projects would be subject to a periodic review, noting that the nature of an excavation site and its regular review component was different from other uses permitted in town. Mr. Spina suggested utilizing a permit expiration at one year from the date of issuance. Mr. Doherty asked if his concerns would be satisfied with the explicit power to modify or revoke an approval alongside an mandatory review; Mr. Spina agreed but wanted to specify the exact points subject to review – in his perspective, the sale and consumption of alcoholic beverages and, to a certain degree, the food component. Mr. Sutton asked if that was something that should be reviewed by Town Counsel; Mr. Doherty felt that it was not needed. Mr. Spina offered that the review could be at a single one-year point – by then, any concerns would be known. Mr. Doherty invited Mr. Sutton to suggest language; Mr. Sutton stated that checking on an applicant was acceptable but was opposed to having the power to shut someone down. Ms. Thornton expressed concern about what basis would be established to trigger revocation of the permit in the event that some number of concerns could be frivolous. Mr. Sutton stated that he didn't see where the Board's power would extend to punitive measures.

Roz Terry noted that she lived across the street from a commercial recreation operation that was used year-round. She noted that if problems arose, the appropriate authorities were engaged to address them. Ms. Terry also noted that every single commercial recreation use in the Town of Southwick was in a residential area.

Mr. Doherty noted that the alcohol matter was always in his mind a Select Board issue and that the Planning Board had neither the expertise nor the authority to decide where it should be used in Town. Mr. Phelps noted that the suggested condition was just a ‘tickler’ for a one-time review by the Board; Mr. Doherty pointed out to the Board members that this approach would only have the Planning Board refer any observed issues to entities assigned with those specific responsibilities. The Board decided to implement the language suggested by Mr. Phelps into this condition, stating, “In a year from the approval of the Modification of the Special Permit, the Planning Board will administratively review compliance with the Terms and Conditions of the permit and provisions of Chapter 185-9, A. (5), (8) and (17).”

*A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Thornton and **SECONDED** by Mr. Sutton to approve the Special Permit Modification decision for 41-51 John Mason Road with the changes discussed.*

***Roll call vote:***

*Mr. Doherty, yes            Mr. Phelps, yes            Mr. Sutton, yes            Mr. Spina, yes*  
*Ms. Thornton, yes*

*The motion passed by unanimous vote.*

---

8:10p.m.                      Master Plan Advisory Committee Discussion

---

The Planning Board reviewed the current list of Master Plan Advisory Committee nominees from member Boards/Departments/Commissions, noting that the Agricultural Commission and Conservation Commission were intending to be represented by a single member that is a member of both Commissions. Chris Pratt, Conservation Chair asked why these two Commissions would only have one voice. Mr. Doherty indicated that part of the motivation had to do with how many total members needed to be managed. Mr. Pratt stated that the two Commission representatives would reflect the efforts to protect the Town’s “rurality” and shouldn’t be compromised through a single vote. Mr. Phelps noted that Pioneer Valley Planning Commission representatives were going to attend the October 5<sup>th</sup> meeting and could dive deeper look closer into the discussion surrounding members. Mr. Doherty shared his thoughts that the original philosophy was that these two Commissions would nominate the same person and it does not seem that is going to be the case.

Mr. Doherty described the process of a ranked-choice vote to select resident representatives for the Master Plan Advisory Committee. Mr. Doherty asked Mr. Pratt if the Conservation Commission had taken a vote to nominate Maryssa Cook-Obregon as the Commission’s representative to the Master Plan Advisory Committee; Mr. Pratt indicated that they had not but that both she and Dave MacWilliams were interested in being part of this Committee. Jessica Thornton noted that Maryssa could represent Conservation and the Agricultural Commission. Mr. Spina indicated his support to add an additional position and have representatives from Conservation Commission and the Agricultural Commission. The Board members agreed to

remove Ms. Cook-Obregon and Mr. MacWilliams from the list of applicants as resident representatives and accept their prospective nominations to roles representing Conservation and Agricultural Commission. Mr. Doherty clarified their interest with Mr. Pratt; Mr. Pratt confirmed their interest and also noted that they were the only members who indicated such interest. Mr. Spina asked if any other resident applicants were on another Board or Commission; Norm Cheever was observed to have submitted his application as a resident representative but had been nominated by the Lake Management Committee as their representative.

Mr. Doherty designated Associate Planning Board member Jessica Thornton as a voting member for appointments to the Master Plan Advisory Committee.

Mr. Terry Mish shared that Linda Bathel has given notice to resign from the Financial Finance Committee and the group would be discussing things further at representative at their meeting the following Tuesday at their normal meeting.

The ranked vote results were read for the record, with Dorrie Boyd receiving 29 points, Roz Terry receiving 27 points, Jessica Whitmore Parker receiving 18 points, Cori Roland receiving 16 points, Dave Massai receiving 14 points, Gregory Hamelin receiving 13 points, Chris Willenborg receiving 12 points, and Jeff Turcotte receiving 11 points.

Ms. Thornton noted that Cori Roland had indicated willingness to be listed as a consultant that would be heavily involved in the process, rather than occupying a member position with the Master Plan Advisory Committee.

Mr. Doherty observed that there was one business owner applicant, Scott Lamon, and that he was seated in the room. Board members noted their support of his candidacy for a role with the Master Plan Advisory Committee regardless of the number of resident applicants.

*A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Sutton and **SECONDED** by Mr. Spina to approve Scott Lamon as the business owner representative and Roz Terry and Dorrie Boyd as resident representatives.*

***Roll call vote:***

*Mr. Doherty, yes      Mr. Phelps, yes      Mr. Sutton, yes      Mr. Spina, yes*  
*Ms. Thornton, yes*

*The motion passed by unanimous vote.*

Mr. Doherty called on Cori Roland, who was attending via Zoom, and asked if she could elaborate on the observation Ms. Thornton shared earlier about her intended participation with the Master Plan Advisory Committee. Ms. Roland stated that she would be willing to participate as an unpaid consultant, particularly in early stages of the process, in order to provide an opportunity for another resident representative to be involved.

Mr. Doherty asked Mr. Phelps to share his input regarding geographic distribution of members; Mr. Phelps noted that Mr. Hamelin lives on the east side of town and was a local homebuilder and past member of the Chicopee Planning Board. Mr. Doherty noted that Roz Terry lived on the west side of town and that Dorrie Boyd lives in a central location. Mr. Phelps noted that Christopher Willenborg lives on the west side of town. Ms. Thornton observed that the next two highest vote recipients, excluding Ms. Roland, were Jessica Whitmore Parker and Dave Massai. She observed that Ms. Parker was an active farmer.

*A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Spina and **SECONDED** by Mr. Phelps to approve Jessica Whitmore Parker as a resident representative to the Master Plan Advisory Committee.*

***Roll call vote:***

*Mr. Doherty, yes      Mr. Phelps, yes      Mr. Sutton, yes      Mr. Spina, yes*  
*Ms. Thornton, yes*

*The motion passed by unanimous vote.*

The board deliberated the next-highest-scoring group of four individuals, noting a strong group of applicants and a broad range of interests represented by the applicants.

*A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Thornton and **SECONDED** by Mr. Sutton to nominate David Massai as a resident representative to the Master Plan Advisory Committee.*

***Roll call vote:***

*Mr. Doherty, yes      Mr. Phelps, yes      Mr. Sutton, yes      Mr. Spina, yes*  
*Ms. Thornton, yes*

*The motion passed by unanimous vote.*

---

Meeting Adjournment

There being no further business to be brought before the board, a MOTION was made by Mr. Sutton and SECONDED by Mr. Spina to close the meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan Goddard  
Town Planner

Meghan Lightcap  
Administrative Assistant

---

Michael Doherty, Chair

---

Marcus Phelps, Vice Chair

---

Richard Utzinger

---

David Sutton

---

David Spina

---

Jessica Thornton, Associate