



Town of Southwick Planning Board MINUTES



**Tuesday, September 7, 2021
7:00 PM (recorded)
Town Hall Land Use Hearing Room**

Written Minutes

(Not verbatim - comments can be heard on recordings available at www.southwick.org)

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

ABSENT: None

The “hybrid” meeting of the Planning Board was scheduled via Zoom and in-person to take place at the Town Hall Land Use Hearing Room and was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Mr. Doherty. He stated that the meeting was being recorded, if anyone else was recording the meeting, asked if all persons could hear, and if the participants on Zoom could sign into the chat and use the raised hand function to ask questions.

INTERIM TOWN PLANNER’S REPORT: 7:00 p.m.

1. Mr. Goddard reports that the hiring process for the Town Planner has come to a close and he is no longer working in an “Interim” capacity for this position. As such, the Construction Observation Services that his firm was previously contracted with the Town to provide for the Greens-East subdivision have formally ceased according to the requirements of the Town Labor Counsel. At this time, the Town has not identified a replacement for Construction Observations.
2. Mr. Goddard received an inquiry from Mr. Carter Gilman, representing the new owner of the Sodom Mountain Campground. The inquiry was based on identifying a permitting path for year-round, hard-plumbed cabins, a use that is not permitted under current bylaws but further research needed to be conducted by Mr. Goddard related to previous permitting efforts prior to providing a final “determination” to Mr. Gilman.

3. Mr. Goddard received an inquiry from Mr. John Houlihan regarding the use of the former Waterman farm property at 83 College Highway and its suitability for a “farm stand.” The limited acreage at this site constrains the pursuit of this use as accessory to a principal farm use, and the current R-40 zoning does not permit a commercial facility for retail sales.
4. Mr. Goddard met with Mr. Vlad Gretchka and one of his business partners regarding the former Tennis Club and Lombella properties off Tannery Road, exploring the potential for usage of the properties for residential use, commercial use, and residential with permitted Home Occupations.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: 7:05 p.m.

1. Mr. Jason Almeida of 6 Sawgrass Lane expressed his frustrations regarding the process of plan amendment related to plantings at the Greens-West subdivision and asked that the Board be mindful of the time and effort that the residents have committed to the process thus far.
2. Ms. Doreen Dargon of 16 Sawgrass Lane raised the topic of the open space access easement crossing her property at the Greens-West subdivision and shared that no one really wanted to use or maintain it. Mr. Doherty noted that this would be discussed as part of an application to revise plans and permits at the subdivisions to be heard on September 21st. Ms. Dargon shared that it would pass right by her bedroom window and asked why it was required; Mr. Phelps noted that it was required as it had evolved from a pocket park that was originally proposed by the developer. Foster Kerrison asked why they did not know about the application, and Mr. Goddard noted that the application had just been received.
3. Ms. Trudy Chiancola of 17 Sawgrass Lane shared that she had provided information to the Board related to a suggested alternative access behind the constructed berm at the development. Ms. Chiancola both confirmed that the information was shared with the developer.

APPOINTMENTS:

7:06 p.m.

217 College Highway

Site Plan Review

Mr. Bryan Balicki of Furrow Engineering represented the application on behalf of the applicant and described plan changes following the last meeting, incorporating larger plantings, relocated fencing, revised sidewalk locations, and added signage. Mr. Doherty asked if the information had been provided to the abutters and Mr. Balicki responded that it had not but the work had been modified to accommodate the existing alignment of the gravel driveway and that the portion of the existing driveway that strays from the right of way limits would be accommodated through the granting of an easement in favor of those sharing the right of way. Mr. Doherty shared that he thought that those who share the existing right of way should have an opportunity to weigh in on the proposal and observed that he was not clear if there were any limitations imposed by an easement versus a right of way. Mr. Doherty asked if having a parallel but separate driveway would be an acceptable alternative; Mr. Balicki shared his opinion that this option would not function well due to the limited width and inability to provide adequate separation. Ms. Thornton also voiced her concern that Police and Fire would need to comment

on the suggested change. Mr. Phelps opined that the plan could be approved contingent on the approval of the proposed easement and Mr. Doherty noted that it should be reviewed by Town Counsel to ensure that no restriction were inadvertently being imposed on those with rights of passage. Ms. Thornton asked if the proposed sidewalk was supposed to have a connection to the building sidewalk; Mr. Balicki stated that the sidewalk was provided solely for the use of those utilizing the right of way.

Mr. Steve Wesolowski of 229 College Highway [*JG: one of the two properties north of the project site that has rights to use the aforementioned right of way*] commented that previous iterations showed a narrower driveway but was widened to make it more accessible to the abutters (*JG: 227 College Highway & 4 Vining Hill Road*) – he voiced his preference for an easement or right of way to be established separate from the daycare facility. He also noted that the existing location of the gravel driveway was restricting the yard space for the daycare facility. He pointed out that it would simplify maintenance, as he and the owners of 4 Vining Hill Road would continue to be responsible for maintaining a separate access. Mr. Phelps asked if the intent was to provide a separate but parallel driveway for the entire length of the subject property from Vining Hill Road northward; Mr. Wesolowski confirmed this proposal.

Mr. Doherty observed that the choice appeared to be either two separate driveways or the shared driveway shown on the project plans. Ms. Thornton observed that the limited area available did not give her the indication that separate driveways would be approved by Police and Fire. Mr. Wesolowski stated that the separate driveway option would be safer in his opinion.

Mr. Balicki clarified Mr. Wesolowski’s comment that the early change in width was actually to provide a narrower driveway width at 22’. Mr. Wesolowski asked if there was a way to merge the two in an effort to avoid as much of a shared driveway as possible between residential and commercial uses. Ms. Thornton stated her strong opinion that public safety would have significant concerns over two separate but very close driveways as suggested. Mr. Wesolowski voiced his concern over delayed emergency access at a single combined-use driveway at peak drop-off hours.

Cynthia Marshall of 45 Coes Hill Road agreed with an earlier observation by Mr. Doherty that the site was tightly constrained; Mr. Doherty noted that they had the right to develop the property under Site Plan Review despite the constraints.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Phelps and **SECONDED** by Mr. Utzinger to endorse the site plan with the condition that any legal document related to an easement or right of way be reviewed by both Town Counsel and the homeowners abutting the right of way for their or their legal Counsel’s review.

Roll call vote:

Mr. Doherty, yes
Mr. Spina, yes

Mr. Phelps, yes
Mr. Sutton, yes

Mr. Utzinger, yes

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Mr. Doherty posted the draft decision on Zoom for Board members to review it as prepared for a single-family home project in the AC zone. Mr. Doherty noted that there were no terms and conditions unique to this project beyond the standard items listed in typical Special Permit and Site Plan Approval decision.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Phelps and **SECONDED** by Mr. Utzinger to approve the special permit with the terms and conditions indicated in the written permit.

Roll call vote:

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

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Phelps and **SECONDED** by Mr. Utzinger to approve the the written decision for a Special Permit and Site Plan Approval for Parcel 2.1 Sodom Mountain Road.

Roll call vote:

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

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Mr. Goddard described the plan submitted to divide a portion of the Davis property along Bugbee Road and College Highway, with the subject acreage fronting on Bugbee Road and lying in the R-40 Zone. Mr. Goddard observed that there were no impediments to access and that the lot conformed to zoning. The Board

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Phelps and **SECONDED** by Mr. Utzinger to endorse the Approval Not Required plan at Bugbee Road.

Roll call vote:

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

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Mr. Doherty read the notice of public hearing into the record and opened the hearing for a Stormwater Management Permit at 115 Fred Jackson Road, a site and project that was previously reviewed for an Estate Lot and Common Driveway Special Permit with Site Plan Approval. Mr. Utzinger recused himself from the matter as an abutter.

Mr. Doherty noted that the Conservation Commission has issued an Order of Conditions for this project; that Kyle Scott, the building inspector, had reviewed the application and had no comment; and that Mr. Goddard, as the Town’s Stormwater Coordinator, provided stormwater-related comments and acknowledged that the Department of Public Works had previously reviewed the proposal and that the current application did not propose any substantive change to the project - no new comments were issued from DPW. Mr. Phelps observed that the state had issued an approval for the project and that it would be referenced in the decision.

Ryan Nelson of R Levesque Associates was in attendance and confirmed Conservation approval and briefly described the components of this residential project subject to review, adding that the State approvals included a 401 Water Quality Certification and a no-take letter from the Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program. Mr. Goddard noted that this particular application was found to have been overlooked in the original submittal and that this effort was brought forth to clean up and close out the local site permitting process for this project.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Phelps and **SECONDED** by Mr. Spina to close the public hearing.

Roll call vote:

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

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Mr. Doherty shared a draft decision with Board members and on Zoom for review and discussion. Mr. Phelps observed that the document needed to reflect that Mr. Utzinger recused himself as an abutter.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Phelps and **SECONDED** by Mr. Spina to approve the Stormwater Management Permit as amended.

Roll call vote:

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

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Mr. Doherty read the notice of public hearing into the record and opened the hearing for a Stormwater Management Permit at 217 College Highway, a site that was previously reviewed by the Board under Site Plan Review for a Day Care Facility. Mr. Bryan Balicki spoke on behalf of the applicant and observed that this particular permit application and observed that there were no changes from the plans reviewed earlier in the evening for the Site Plan Review permitting component. Mr. Goddard observed that this particular application was the result of a close-out review similar to the matter at 115 Fred Jackson Road and that there was an apparent “historic miscommunication” where materials were submitted but the Stormwater permit and application had not been formalized.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Phelps and **SECONDED** by Mr. Utzinger to close the public hearing.

Roll call vote:

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

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Board members noted several minor adjustments to be incorporated into the final decision for the application, including a reference to DPW input for the water meter pit location.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Phelps and **SECONDED** by Mr. Spina to approve the Stormwater Management Permit for 217 College Highway with the terms and conditions indicated in the written permit.

Roll call vote:

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

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Phelps and **SECONDED** by Mr. Spina to approve the written decision for the Stormwater Management Permit for 217 College Highway.

Roll call vote:

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

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

7:20 p.m.

115 Fred Jackson Road

Estate Lot & Common Driveway
Special Permit & Site Plan Approval
Decision

With the public hearing closed, Mr. Doherty notified the applicant's representative that this decision would be moved to routine business and addressed later in the meeting to accommodate members of the public that are attending for other hearings.

7:25 p.m.

42 Depot Street

Special Permit, Site Plan Approval, Earth Excavation
Special Permit, Wellhead Protection District Special
Permit, and Stormwater Management Permit
Continued Public Hearing

Mr. Doherty greeted Ryan Nelson from R Levesque Associates, Inc. as the applicant's representative and acknowledged his intention to request a continuance owing to continued revisions related to DPW comments; Mr. Nelson confirmed this point.

Mr. Doherty read a letter from Barbara Phelps, an abutter, in support of a public parking area to serve users of the Southwick Rail Trail and suggesting a sidewalk connection from the interior of the development.

Mr. Doherty confirmed distribution of a traffic study for the Depot Street – Powder Mill Road corridor to the Board members and shared that no accidents were logged at the rail trail crossing in the study. Mr. Doherty noted that the breadth and scope of any potential intersection improvements related to this project were still being developed.

Ms. Thornton supported Mrs. Phelps' suggestions in that it may alleviate some of the safety concerns as they relate to the current private parking area that many people use, forcing them to cross the intersection to access the rail trail. Mr. Doherty noted that there may be some stormwater management issues that prevent direct implementation of the suggestion.

Beth Capitano of 56 South View Drive asked if a vote was to be taken this evening; Mr. Doherty relayed that the applicant's representative was still working to respond to comments from the Department of Public Works. Ms. Capitano asked how the additional traffic generated by the development would affect nearby streets, and Mr. Doherty responded that it was his opinion through interpretation of the traffic/corridor study that safety issues lay elsewhere but that general safety improvements such as brush clearing or signage might be considered. Ms. Capitano also asked about how existing and planted buffers would affect what abutting landowners would see. Mr. Doherty noted that the site plan would best address that question once revisions had been made by the site design team.

Ralph Vecchio of 33 Depot Street shared that the police department frequently monitors the Depot/South Longyard/Powder Mill intersection and often issues tickets to violators that do not stop when turning onto Depot Street. Mr. Doherty noted that one of the suggestions in the traffic

study was to narrow the intersection to enhance safety but would likely be a more comprehensive improvement project undertaken by the Town at a later point in time.

Cindy Marshall of 45 Coes Hill Road observed that the traffic study was conducted seven years ago and opined that the traffic counts would be significantly greater at this time; she felt that it would not be inappropriate for the Board to request an independent traffic study at the applicant's burden. Ms. Thornton observed that if Ms. Marshall's assumption were to be correct, a new traffic study at that location would show that the percentage of impact from the development would be even less than was discussed. Mr. Doherty noted that the existing design issues may not be affected by the projected traffic load from the proposed residential development.

Ray Panlilio of 32 SouthView Drive asked what time of year the traffic study was performed and Ms. Thornton responded that the rail trail pedestrian count data was taken on select days in July and August, including Saturdays, Sundays, and Fridays. Mr. Vecchio shared his thoughts that there would be more traffic during the school year than during the summer.

Jack Galanek of 98 South Longyard Road shared his opinion that the traffic at Depot Street hadn't changed in the twenty years he had been driving on it. He had never seen anyone not stop at the intersection.

Guy Barbieri of 17 Southwick Hill Road echoed Ms. Capitano's concerns about vegetated buffers at the development and changing views at abutting residences. He shared his concern that a homeowner's association should be put into place in order to have some manner of governance for any unit- or bedroom-related changes.

Mr. Doherty, reflecting on the earlier topic regarding the time of year that vehicle counts were collected at the Depot Street/South Longyard Road/Powder Mill Corridor, noted that the motor vehicle data was collected in April and May of 2014.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Utzinger and **SECONDED** by Mr. Spina to continue the public hearing to 7:45 on September 21, 2021. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

8:00 p.m.

41-51 John Mason Road

Special Permit Modification
Continued Public Hearing & Decision

Randy Brown and Freda Brown were in attendance to represent the application for a Special Permit Modification submittal for the New England Disc Golf Center (hereafter referred to as NEDGC) at 41-51 John Mason Road. Mr. Doherty noted that this was a continued public hearing and began the discussion by acknowledging correspondence distribution from Attorney Diana Day and a letter from Jessica Pelley, clarifying the intent of her previously submitted correspondence and concerns for the project. Mr. Doherty then noted that he had attended a meeting of the Southwick Board of Health (BOH) on August 19, 2021, as were the applicants. Mr. Doherty summarized the discussion with the BOH, where they (the BOH) noted that no

application was currently before the BOH upon which to render a decision, clarified the role/authority of the Southwick Health Director, and offered their opinions on what may be necessary for this project as far as anticipated filings. Mr. Doherty summarized that the discussion provided adequate confirmation of the BOH position, aligning with Ms. Spencer’s previous correspondence. Mr. Doherty noted that the current application before the Planning Board has adequately addressed any BOH-related concerns at this point.

Attorney Day raised a point discussed with the BOH regarding trailers and that Mr. Brown had shared a picture of a food truck that Mr. Brown had intended to purchase. Mr. Brown then shared a picture of the unit that was intended to be purchased, clarifying that it was a sample picture and not the exact unit. Mr. Brown continued to clarify that the picture was of a trailer-mounted unit that the State defines as a “mobile food establishment” (MFE), and that the Board of Health did not have any concerns about the current or proposed operations at the Disc Golf Course. Mr. Phelps observed that the MFE definition helps to address concerns regarding the use of “trailers” at the property.

Mr. Spina asked if there was any insight into the prohibition of alcohol use that was a condition in the existing permit. Mr. Phelps replied that he had consulted with Roz Terry, a former Planning Board Chair and member, and reviewed the minutes pertaining to the original application. His observation was that the only reference to alcohol was found in the August 16, 2016 minutes, where “no alcohol served on the premises” was found with no subsequent or prior discussion on the matter. Mr. Doherty offered that there wasn’t any discussion because the matter wasn’t contested at that time; Ms. Brown concurred and indicated that the provision of food and beverage wasn’t contemplated at that time.

Attorney Day urged the Board to consider that “over 45” residents had signed petitions against this proposal and asked that a one-year renewal be considered as a condition for the permit and clarify what bylaw the Board will be voting under for their review.

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Thornton and **SECONDED** by Mr. Sutton to close the public hearing.

Roll call vote:

Mr. Doherty, yes	Mr. Phelps, Abstained	Mr. Sutton, yes
Mr. Spina, yes	Mrs. Thornton, yes	

The motion passed by majority vote.

Mr. Doherty expressed his preference to conduct the vote on the application at the next meeting, observing that some revisions to the draft decision were necessary, but also acknowledged that the primary concerns raised by those opposing the permit modification were less of an issue with the Planning Board than they are with the Select Board and Board of Health. He then shared his inclination to the Board to grant the permit with conditions, seeing that the operation was not that different from any other golf course in Town and not seeing the food and beverage service as a primary draw to the site. Ms. Thornton asked if the decision could be written to note that what

specific beverages to be served would be decided by the Select Board. Mr. Phelps thought that a condition should be included as related to the MFE and observed that if the existing condition related to alcohol were to be removed, that would place the responsibility for the decision of alcoholic beverage sales on the Select Board. Mr. Phelps added his opinion that the hours and months of operation should be defined and aligned with that of the disc golf course, and that the Board consider a review of the permit one year after issuance as related to sanitary waste concerns, should considerable sales of concessions take place. Mr. Sutton asked if that was the job of the Select Board based on the liquor license; Mr. Phelps agreed that it was but maintained his concern for adequate sanitary facilities. Mr. Sutton raised the question of how many other permits for recreation facilities have that kind of contingencies. Mr. Doherty indicated that the Board should be specific to which issue was to be addressed by any condition specifying a review. Mr. Phelps suggested that the Board consider a re-write of the existing condition pertaining to a review period; Ms. Thornton expressed her opposition to doing so as it was not considered a “good” condition. Mr. Doherty shared that he did not want to conduct a hearing on the matter each year; Mr. Phelps suggested that the condition leave out the first [existing] sentence, with the rest to remain and that the review would be conducted as a part of regular Planning Board business with input from Town departments and officials – not as a hearing. Ms. Thornton expanded on the idea by asking under what authority the Planning Board would conduct any action based on something revealed by a review, given that the specific matters of alcohol sales and sanitary facilities are under the purview of other regulatory bodies, not the Planning Board. Mr. Doherty expressed his opinion that some of those concerns could be corrected through the course of business but would also be controlled by the Board of Health. Mr. Spina noted that some aspects of this decision do fall within the scope of review by the Planning Board, such as excessive noise or traffic issues, and that his preference would be to have a review out of precaution. Mr. Doherty indicated that Town Counsel should review the legality of such a condition and that the Planning Board review process should be defined and include a sunset clause. Mr. Phelps offered to draft the condition for the Board to review and discuss.

The Board reviewed the draft conditions as related to the proposed [new] accessory uses and decided to aim for issuing a decision at the September 21, 2021 meeting.

8:20 p.m.

Town of Southwick Stormwater Regulations

Public Hearing

Mr. Doherty read the notice of public hearing into the record and welcomed Mr. Goddard as the Town’s Stormwater Coordinator to guide the discussion on new Stormwater Regulations. Mr. Goddard observed that the recent stormwater bylaw passed at the annual Town Meeting were still in a review period but were structured to make reference to a separate regulation that would be adopted and updated at a Public Hearing of the Planning Board. Mr. Goddard pointed out that the rainfall projections to be used in stormwater calculations were changing from an outdated static model to NOAA Atlas 14 – a dynamic model that takes into account changing weather patterns. Mr. Goddard pointed out that the static model’s projection for a 100-year, 24-hour storm in Southwick was 7.5” of rainfall, and the updated model will bring that figure to roughly 11.5” for the same storm event. Ms. Thornton asked how frequently the Atlas 14 database would

a local business owner, four resident representatives, and a representative from either the School Committee or School Department. The Board discussed whether the School Committee or School Department should have the voice on the MPAC or as a consultant. Mr. Doherty shared his thoughts on a consultants list, including the Police and Fire Departments (separately), whichever School “group” was not chosen for MPAC membership, the Water Commission, the Historical Commission, the Board of Health, the Council on Aging, Cultural Commission, and Housing Committee. Mr. Phelps asked Mr. Doherty for his rationale regarding having a Finance Committee member on the MPAC; Mr. Doherty responded by saying that the group is responsible for “doing the numbers” and implementing, incorporating a very broad, high-level perspective and helping to ground the Committee – a point that may not have been tended to in the 1997 Master Plan.

DPW Director Randy Brown suggested that other utilities interest such as high speed communications and gas could be included as consultants.

Mr. Doherty asked the Board if a minimum membership duration should be established for a Board or Committee member to be eligible for nomination to the MPAC. Mr. Doherty also noted that the nomination should not involve the Planning Board. Ms. Thornton suggested that when the Planning Board reaches out to these groups, the correspondence include a request for well-rounded experience to assist with a historical perspective. Mr. Phelps noted that a Committee usually isn’t finalized until a Consultant has been engaged but that wasn’t a requirement. Ms. Thornton agreed that a Consultant should be identified prior to the first meeting of the subcommittee. Mr. Doherty concurred but wanted to tie down the Committee membership and, if necessary, tweak it moving forward.

Mr. Phelps noted that the Committee could either release a Request for Proposals (RFPs) or contract directly with the Pioneer Valley Planning Commission (PVPC). Blandford and East Longmeadow have both engaged PVPC for their master plans. Mr. Phelps noted that there is a time and effort component to conducting and managing a RFP. Mr. Phelps also spoke with Catherine Ratté at PVPC and invited her team to speak at the September 21st, 2021 meeting of the Planning Board for an overview of the process. Ms. Thornton observed that the benefit of proceeding with an RFP was hard to envision in light of the time and effort that would need to be committed to the process. Mr. Phelps also noted that the Town was also funded for a Housing Plan.

Diane Gale asked the Board who was responsible for choosing the make-up of the MPAC; Mr. Doherty responded that the Planning Board is responsible for choosing the resident representatives and the business owner representative but wants the individual Boards/Committees approved by the Select Board. Ms. Gale asked why Town Staff did not adopt the 1997 Master Plan; Mr. Doherty shared his understanding that there was some effort to move the Town Center in the 1997 plan – Ms. Gale said that effort was already underway – and Mr. Doherty said that component was a sticking point of that master plan. He also noted that other components of the 1997 Master Plan were implemented. Ms. Gale asked what happened to it and Mr. Phelps shared his research that it appeared that the matter simply dropped as reflected in Planning Board minutes. Mr. Doherty shared that the Planning Board would be responsible for adopting the document and that the Master Plan is referenced in multiple places throughout

the Town Bylaws. He added that the Town also has the opportunity to change where and how the Master Plan is referenced in the bylaws. Ms. Gale asked about how to emphasize diversity in the membership in light of the minimum length of service mentioned earlier and Mr. Doherty responded that the aim of the group make-up should be to achieve balance.

Dorrie Boyd shared that there may be an opportunity to apply for a grant through the U.S. Department of Economic Development Administration through the U.S. Department of Commerce. Mr. Doherty asked that the information be shared with him or the Town Planner. Mr. Phelps noted that the PVPC could be an ally in securing additional funding through grants.

Mr. Doherty stated that the Planning Board would review resident representative applications on September 21st, 2021.

ROUTINE BUSINESS – 8:40 p.m.:

Minutes

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Thornton and **SECONDED** by Mr. Spina to approve the Meeting Minutes of June 29, 2021 with edits. The motion passed unanimously.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Phelps and **SECONDED** by Mr. Spina to approve the Meeting Minutes of July 13, 2021 with edits. The motion passed unanimously.

Wireless Communications Services District – Bylaw Revision: *Discussion*

Mr. Doherty noted that the matter was to be advertised as a Public Hearing to formalize the bylaw revision process. Mr. Phelps noted that the original bylaw had no discussion in 1998, as the district was limited to the Industrial zones, but the 2001 revision to add certain Town-owned properties. Mr. Phelps added that there was no scientific process to determining the district boundaries.

Select Board member Doug Moglin observed that the suggested hearing would have to be open for a long time to close within 90 days of a Town Meeting and added that the Planning Board should submit a letter to request the amendment from the Select Board for referral and to hold the Public Hearing.

115 Fred Jackson Road: Estate Lot & Common Driveway Special Permit and Site Plan Approval
Decision

Mr. Goddard distributed the draft decision to the Planning Board Members and shared the document via Zoom. Members reviewed the findings and conditions, noting that the decision should include Site Plan Approval.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Phelps and **SECONDED** by Mr. Spina grant the Special Permit and Site Plan Approval for an Estate Lot at 115 Fred Jackson Road as noted with the terms and conditions of the written decision.

Roll call vote:

Mr. Doherty, yes	Mr. Phelps, yes	Mr. Sutton, yes
Mr. Spina, yes	Mrs. Thornton, yes	

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Phelps and **SECONDED** by Mr. Spina grant the Special Permit and Site Plan Approval for a Common Driveway at 115 Fred Jackson Road as noted with the terms and conditions of the written decision.

Roll call vote:

Mr. Doherty, yes	Mr. Phelps, yes	Mr. Sutton, yes
Mr. Spina, yes	Mrs. Thornton, yes	

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Phelps and **SECONDED** by Mr. Spina approve the written decision for the Special Permit and Site Plan Approval for an Estate Lot and Common Driveway at 115 Fred Jackson Road.

Roll call vote:

Mr. Doherty, yes	Mr. Phelps, yes	Mr. Sutton, yes
Mr. Spina, yes	Mrs. Thornton, yes	

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Meeting Adjournment

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.

The Next Scheduled Meeting is September 21st, 2021.

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan Goddard
Town Planner

Michael Doherty, Chair

Marcus Phelps, Vice Chair

Richard Utzinger

David Sutton

David Spina

Jessica Thornton, Associate