



RECEIVED  
20 DEC 28 PM 12:10  
**NORTHBRIDGE PLANNING BOARD**  
**MINUTES**



**Tuesday, November 10, 2020**

NORTHBRIDGE TOWN CLERK  
LINDA B. CYMIEN

<https://zoom.us/j/98026773436?pwd=TWxyOWtPV1pEUmJWcXIET9lNSt0dz09>

Meeting ID: 980 2677 3436

Passcode: 371526

Dial-in Option: +1 (929) 205-6099

Pursuant to Governor Baker's March 12, 2020 Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, MGL Chapter 30A Section 18 and the Governor's March 15, 2020 Order concerning imposition on strict limitations on the number of people that may gather in one place, meetings of the Northbridge Planning Board shall be conducted via remote participation to the greatest extent possible. No in-person attendance of members of the public will be permitted, but every effort will be made to ensure that the public may adequately access the proceedings as provided in the Order.

Recognizing the presence of a quorum by roll call vote, Chair Brian Massey (Yes) called the meeting (virtual meeting) to order at 7:07PM. Harry Berkowitz - Yes; James Berkowitz - Yes; Abdul Kafal - Yes; and Rainer Forst - Yes were in attendance. R. Gary Bechtholdt II, Town Planner and Barbara A. Kinney, Planning Administrative Assistant were also present. One (1) Planning Board vacancy remains (Associate Member).

The following members of the public were in attendance: Jeff Walsh, Graves Engineering; John Grenier, JM Grenier Associates; Kevin Cotter; Norman Hill, Land Planning, Inc.; Dave Eldredge; Holly Henault; Bill & Vanessa Greco, Shamus McGovern; Gary Arpin; Josh Skowyra; Spencer Pollack; Steve O'Connell, Turning Point Engineering; Taryn & Mike DiVirglio; and Bill Renaud.

## **I. CITIZENS FORUM**

B. Massey explained, Citizen's Forum is intended to provide the public with an opportunity to present concerns to the Planning Board not included on the agenda. Citizen's Forum is not meant to be a back-and-forth discussion. If the Planning Board feels a follow-up discussion is warranted, arrangements may be made to discuss concerns at the next available meeting with the hopes of concluding a resolution. Having no comments during Citizens' Forum the Planning Board moved to agenda items.

## **II. 342-350 PROVIDENCE ROAD - PUBLIC HEARING**

**8-unit Multi-family Dwelling - §173.49.1 - Site Plan Review**

**Assessors Map 24, Parcel 104**

Upon motion duly made (H. Berkowitz) and seconded (J. Berkowitz), the Planning Board voted 5-0 by roll call vote of H. Berkowitz - Yes; J. Berkowitz - Yes; A. Kafal - Yes; R. Forst - Yes; and B. Massey - Yes to waive the reading of the Public Hearing Notice. "In accordance with the provisions of Mass General Laws, Town of Northbridge Zoning Bylaw Chapter 173, and the Governor's Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, GL c. 30A Sec. 18, the Northbridge Planning Board shall meet via virtual means to hold a public hearing Tuesday, November 10, 2020 at 7:05PM (via ZOOM) to consider Site Plan Review Application of 342-350 Providence Road, LLC (David Eldredge) for multi-family dwelling consisting of up to 8-units for 342-350 Providence Road. Subject property (Assessors Map 24, Parcel 104) is designated within Residential Four (R4) Zoning District of the Town of Northbridge. A copy of Site Plan Review Application (June 19, 2020),

Stormwater Report (June 15, 2020), Site Development Plan (April 07, 2020) entitled "Site Plan for Force Main Sewer Connection located at 342-350 Providence Road" prepared by Land Planning, Inc. and other supportive documentation is on file with the Town Clerk (7 Main Street) and Community Planning & Development Office (14 Hill Street) and may be viewed during posted office hours or via online at [northbridgema.org/planning-board](http://northbridgema.org/planning-board). The purpose of this notice is to provide opportunity for public comment. Anyone wishing to be heard may submit comments directly to the Planning Board at [planning@northbridgema.org](mailto:planning@northbridgema.org) or participate during the public hearing (Meeting ID / Passcode to be included on posted Agenda)."

With the notification requirements having been satisfied, the Planning Board opened the public hearing.

Dave Eldredge (Applicant) and Norman Hill (engineer) explained that there is commercial space on the first floor of the existing building and two (2) residential apartments above. They have received Special Permit approval from the Zoning Board of Appeals to convert the commercial space to two (2) residential apartments and construct an additional four (4) residential apartments for a total of eight (8) units. The existing property is on septic but the residential apartments will be connected to the town sewer system. The Conservation Commission has issued an Order of Conditions and the Zoning Board of Appeals has issued a Special Permit. This project will meet all zoning bylaws and will have town water and sewer.

G. Bechtholdt explained that the Safety Committee has concerns (parking, circulation, etc.) and these will need to be addressed on the revised plan which they will review upon receipt. The peer review report from Graves Engineering is coming soon.

The Planning Board is in receipt of correspondence from an abutter who has concerns with the existing driveways. They are looking for a remedy so that cars turning into the apartment property from the northbound lane will not cut across their existing driveway which sits right next to the apartment entrance. N. Hill explained that the landscaping between the two (2) driveways has since been extended to delineate the two (2) driveways better. The existing property has two (2) access points and the new apartments will only have one (1) access point. H. Berkowitz wanted to know what the Fire Chief thought about not having access all the way around the building. There is only one area that will not have truck access and each apartment will have sprinklers. B. Massey wanted to know if there is an opportunity to move the access to the middle of the site for more separation between the driveways. N. Hill explained that the access is where it is so the flow of traffic will not be where the residents park their vehicles or where they will be walking. He will look at shifting it over some and the Safety Committee will take a look at it too. D. Eldredge said the island has been cut smaller so it should alleviate the access issue. Jeff Walsh, Graves Engineering, explained that he received the revised plans yesterday but has not had time to review them yet. He would like to see the landscaping extended closer to the travel lane with low growing shrubs to discourage cars from cutting across the abutter's driveway. Grass at that end of the landscape island would be more likely to be just driven over.

Upon motion duly made (H. Berkowitz) and seconded (J. Berkowitz), the Planning Board voted 5-0 by roll call vote of H. Berkowitz – Yes; J. Berkowitz – Yes; A. Kafal – Yes; R. Forst – Yes; and B. Massey – Yes to continue the Public Hearing to November 24, 2020 at 7:05PM.

### III. CAMELOT SUBDIVISION –REVIEW / DECISION

#### Curbing Type & Sidewalk Material - Construction Change Request(s)

Steve O'Connell, Turning Point Engineering explained that they are requesting construction changes for curbing and sidewalks on two (2) sections of the project consisting of the rest of Rebecca Road to Hillcrest Road, Genivieve Drive, and Grace Street. They would like to change the granite vertical sidewalk to Cape Cod berm and the sidewalk material from concrete to asphalt. The street tree reduction that was previously discussed informally is not being requested at this time.

*Upon motion duly made (H. Berkowitz) and seconded (J. Berkowitz), the Planning Board voted 5-0 by roll call vote of H. Berkowitz – Yes; J. Berkowitz – Yes; A. Kafal – Yes; R. Forst – Yes; and B. Massey – Yes to consider the curbing request a construction change.*

B. Massey stated that he is against changing from granite to Cape Cod berm. The Planning Board has worked very hard to have granite curbing installed in all new developments unless another department requests an alternative for a valid reason. Also several lots would be half and half if the change is allowed at this time for the rest of this development.

Shamus McGovern stated that it would be awkward with half the development one way and half the other way. He feels the Subdivision Rules and Regulations should be followed as they say that granite curbing must be used and the change in curbing is less safe too. Also when he bought his house he was told the curbing would be granite. Holly Henault stated it does not make sense to change halfway through the project. It will also not be aesthetically pleasing. Bill Greco does not see the value of changing halfway through. This is where they live and not the developers. Spencer Pollack lives on Lot 57 and has the concern that a portion of his lot would be granite and a portion would be Cape Cod berm. He wants continuity and thinks there would be safety concerns with lots of children in the neighborhood. J. Berkowitz stated that he can see both sides. S. O'Connell explained that the curbing could be extended on Lots 57 and 42 to keep those lots consistent. R. Forst wanted to know why the change was requested. S. O'Connell explained that it was born out of others coming in to complete the project. They are concerned with costs and view utilities, etc. as necessities and curbing and sidewalks as more an amenity. The contractor did a cost analysis and if these construction changes are not approved, they may need to walk away and not help complete the project, per S. O'Connell. B. Massey stated that the subdivision was already approved and in his opinion the investors are already "in" as blasting has been done and utilities are going in. The Planning Board has required all new developments to have vertical curbing and B. Massey has never seen it changed halfway through. He is against the change as the curbing was already started.

J. Walsh stated that each project should be looked at separately as each project has their own circumstances. It is his opinion that Cape Cod berm would be acceptable as Hillcrest Road has Cape Cod berm and asphalt sidewalk. However, he does not see any reason to change. It is just aesthetic and maintenance reasons. Either would work and are acceptable but the vertical curbing is what was approved.

*Upon motion duly made (J. Berkowitz) and seconded (A. Kafal), the Planning Board voted 1-4 by roll call vote of J. Berkowitz – Yes; H. Berkowitz – No; R. Forst – No; A. Kafal – No and B. Massey – No to approve the curbing change to Cape Cod berm based on the discussion.*

Upon motion duly made (J. Berkowitz) and seconded (H. Berkowitz), the Planning Board voted 5-0 by roll call vote of J. Berkowitz – Yes; H. Berkowitz – Yes; R. Forst – Yes; A. Kafal – Yes and B. Massey – Yes to deny the curbing change to Cape Cod berm based on the discussion.

Upon motion duly made (H. Berkowitz) and seconded (J. Berkowitz), the Planning Board voted 5-0 by roll call vote of H. Berkowitz – Yes; J. Berkowitz – Yes; A. Kafal – Yes; R. Forst – Yes; and B. Massey – Yes to consider the sidewalk material request a construction change.

S. O'Connell explained that concrete sidewalks are costly and do not hold up as well to the New England weather with salting, etc. Heaving and concrete breakdown becomes an issue. J. Walsh stated that both materials are a recognized product and sidewalks are not usually salted. Asphalt does hold up well unless broken by tree roots. There is usually a grass strip between the roadway and the sidewalk. J & F Marinella is still building the houses and has a group of investors (sort of) for the infrastructure per S. O'Connell. B. Greco stated that the subcontractor agreed with the conditions when they invested and bought into the completion of work. They should consider the residents and keep the conditions of approval the same. H. Henault agrees and wants the same for aesthetic reasons and well as when walking down the street and pulling a wagon it will remain consistent and easier to do. These are different streets but one development. H. Berkowitz stated that the Department of Public Works prefers bituminous concrete and wants us to change the rules and regulations to reflect that. The sidewalk material change would start between Lots 56 & 57 and Lots 42 & 43. J. Berkowitz stated that would look ridiculous but agrees that asphalt could be done but it seems like a weird transition. He would like to know what the rest of the Board thinks. A. Kafal stated he would approve the change as the Planning Board allowed the change for another development. B. Massey agrees that it has been allowed for other developments but those were requested by the Conservation and / or the Department of Public Works. He does not have a problem with asphalt as the Department of Public Works does prefer it. His only concern is that half the development will be with concrete and the other half would be asphalt.

Upon motion duly made (A. Kafal) and seconded (R. Forst), the Planning Board voted 5-0 by roll call vote of H. Berkowitz – Yes; J. Berkowitz – Yes; A. Kafal – Yes; R. Forst – Yes; and B. Massey – Yes to not approve the construction change for the sidewalk material so it will remain consistent throughout the subdivision.

## OLD / NEW BUSINESS

### Approval of Meeting Minutes –September 22, 2020 & October 13, 2020

Upon motion duly made (H. Berkowitz) and seconded A. Kafal), the Planning Board voted 5-0 by roll call vote of H. Berkowitz – Yes; J. Berkowitz – Yes; A. Kafal – Yes; R. Forst – Yes; and B. Massey – Yes to approve the minutes of September 22, 2020 as written.

Upon motion duly made (H. Berkowitz) and seconded (A. Kafal), the Planning Board voted 5-0 by roll call vote of H. Berkowitz – Yes; J. Berkowitz – Yes; A. Kafal – Yes; R. Forst – Yes; and B. Massey – Yes to approve the minutes of October 13, 2020 as written.

### Digital Submission Standards – Discussion / Consideration to Amend Subdivision Regulations

This discussion / consideration has been tabled to the next meeting.

10 Watson Farm Road (AP 12 / 28) – Discussion / Informal Review

Planning Board reviewed correspondence received from Beth Stanley regarding creating additional house lots on Watson Farm Road (10 Watson Farm Road -subject property). Ms. Stanley seek direction from the Planning Board on required permitting and approval to create twelve (12) lots. H. Berkowitz believes a subdivision approval would be required, suggesting creating 12 lots via the ANR process is not appropriate, noting a number of lots were created along Upton Street a number of years ago and it's a nightmare. G. Bechtholdt agreed with Mr. Berkowitz, suggesting additional information would need to be provided regarding the formal status of Watson Farm Road (public/private). Based upon the information presented the Planning Board determined the creation of 12 lots would require definitive subdivision approval, where Approval Not Required (ANR) would not be applicable.

Mike's Way, Roadway Cutting Plan (proposed) –Review / Decision

John Grenier, JM Grenier Associates, noted in the Conditions of Approval site clearing was limited to the 50-foot Right-of-Way. His client, Ron Henault needs a wider swath to provide the necessary slopes and fills on the sides. Mr. Grenier presented a plan showing proposed limit of clearing on Roadway Cut Plan dated October 22, 2020. R. Forst questioned why this was not brought up before this. G. Bechtholdt explained limiting and restricting clear-cutting of site has always been included as conditions of approval, where the Developer(s) should not be allowed to completely open up a site; it's aimed to control potential runoff and hopefully encourage Developers to retain as many existing trees as possible. Mr. Grenier indicated the basin will be constructed to capture runoff. J. Grenier explained that there will be more clearing on each lot in the future. B. Massey pointed out that there will be a good portion of clearing done on each lot for the roadway installation. J. Walsh stated that it makes sense to open it up for the roadway this way. *Upon motion duly made (H. Berkowitz) and seconded (A. Kafal), the Planning Board voted 5-0 by roll call vote of H. Berkowitz – Yes; J. Berkowitz – Yes; A. Kafal – Yes; R. Forst – Yes; and B. Massey – Yes to approve the additional clearing needed to install the roadway and utilities.* G. Bechtholdt informed the Planning Board that the curb cut on Providence Road (Rt 122) has been approved by MassHighway. Once J. Walsh reviews the plans, they will be submitted to the Planning Board for endorsement. J. Grenier is waiting for the surveyor to finalize the property lines. The Zoning Board of Appeals approval for multi-family dwellings is next on J. Grenier's list. Mr. Bechtholdt reminded Mr. Grenier and Mr. Henault that no work on the site may commence until the plan is recorded at the Registry and a pre-construction meeting is convened in accordance with the subdivision approval.

Leonardo Estates -Construction Change Requests / Performance Surety Update / Extension

Steve O'Connell, Turning Point Engineering, explained that the developer is requesting a construction change to eliminate the sidewalk within the Leonardo Estates subdivision. It was previously determined to be a modification and would like the Planning Board to reconsider the request. The elimination of the sidewalk has the full support of the residents on the street as indicated by the signed petition. There is no sidewalk on Highland Street. *Upon motion duly made (J. Berkowitz) and seconded (R. Forst), the Planning Board voted (once again) 5-0 by roll call vote of H. Berkowitz – Yes; J. Berkowitz – Yes; A. Kafal – Yes; R. Forst – Yes; and B. Massey – Yes to consider the requested elimination of the sidewalk a subdivision modification and not a construction change. Once the applicant submits a subdivision modification, a Public Hearing will be scheduled to consider the elimination of the sidewalk.*

The second request is to consider the modification to the guardrail as a construction change. The request is to modify the proposed guardrail on both sides of Windstone Drive between stations 13+50+/- and 16+00+/-

by installing I-beam posts with a timber rail in lieu of a guardrail with timber posts and rails. The reason for this request is that a geogrid fabric was utilized in the construction of the adjacent retaining wall and the digging required to install timber posts could interfere with the geogrid, whereas the steel I-beam posts can be driven through the ground and geogrid fabric. Also, they are requesting a modification to the location of the proposed guardrail by installing the guardrail 12-18 inches back from the face of the curb in lieu of the 18-24 inches as illustrated on the approved plans. The depth of the I-beam is greater than the wood post and therefore the face of the guardrail will move slightly closer to the roadway. *Upon motion duly made (J. Berkowitz) and seconded (R. Forst), the Planning Board voted 5-0 by roll call vote of H. Berkowitz – Yes; J. Berkowitz – Yes; A. Kafal – Yes; R. Forst – Yes; and B. Massey – Yes to consider the changes to the guardrail a construction change.* J. Leonardo stated that the guardrail is not part of the retaining wall permit. This change will not impact that permit. J. Walsh has no issues with the changes to the guardrail. If the sidewalk is to be installed, there is enough room and there would be no safety concerns. *Upon motion duly made (H. Berkowitz) and seconded (R. Forst), the Planning Board voted 5-0 by roll call vote of H. Berkowitz – Yes; J. Berkowitz – Yes; A. Kafal – Yes; R. Forst – Yes; and B. Massey – Yes to approve the changes to the guardrail subject to the approval of the Department of Public Works in writing.*

The next request is to eliminate the curb cuts and driveway aprons that provide access to the stormwater level spreaders within Easement A & B and Easement C & D. The curb cuts and driveway aprons will be unsightly since they are just an opening to a vegetated path. *Upon motion duly made (H. Berkowitz) and seconded (J. Berkowitz), the Planning Board voted 5-0 by roll call vote of H. Berkowitz – Yes; J. Berkowitz – Yes; A. Kafal – Yes; R. Forst – Yes; and B. Massey – Yes to consider the changes to the curb cuts and driveway aprons a construction change.* S. O'Connell explained that in consultation with Jim Shuris, Department of Public Works Director, access to the stormwater level spreaders will not be hindered by the elimination of these curb cuts and driveway aprons and therefore he indicated his support for the request. J. Walsh has no problem with these change(s). *Upon motion duly made (H. Berkowitz) and seconded (R. Forst), the Planning Board voted 5-0 by roll call vote of H. Berkowitz – Yes; J. Berkowitz – Yes; A. Kafal – Yes; R. Forst – Yes; and B. Massey – Yes to approve the changes to the curb cuts and driveway aprons subject to the approval of the Department of Public Works in writing.*

Planning Board considered performance bond update for Leonardo Estates. G. Bechtholdt noted, the updated bond estimate includes the const for sidewalk, suggesting if the Board grants a waiver to eliminate, the bond may be revised accordingly. J. Leonardo is fine with the same type of bond and the amount of \$371,000 as calculated by Jeff Walsh, PE (Planning Board Consultant). *Upon motion duly made (H. Berkowitz) and seconded (A. Kafal), the Planning Board voted 5-0 by roll call vote of H. Berkowitz – Yes; J. Berkowitz – Yes; A. Kafal – Yes; R. Forst – Yes; and B. Massey – Yes to extend the date of completion to October 31, 2021. Upon motion duly made (H. Berkowitz) and seconded (A. Kafal), the Planning Board voted 5-0 by roll call vote of H. Berkowitz – Yes; J. Berkowitz – Yes; A. Kafal – Yes; R. Forst – Yes; and B. Massey – Yes to approve the amount of \$371,000 to be held by performance security.*

J. Leonardo was to provide a brief update on the overall status of construction however was unable to do so due to technical difficulties with his ZOOM connection.

Appointment of Planning Board Delegate(s) to CMRPC (FY2021)

Upon motion duly made (H. Berkowitz) and seconded (A. Kafal), the Planning Board voted 5-0 by roll call vote of A. Kafal – Yes; R. Forst – Yes; H. Berkowitz – Yes; J. Berkowitz – Yes and B. Massey – Yes to (re)appoint J. Berkowitz and B. Massey as delegates to Central Massachusetts Regional Planning Commission.

#### Subdivision/Site Development –Status / Updates

The Planning Board noted receipt of reports from Graves Engineering, Inc.

#### 2021 Planning Board Meeting Calendar

This agenda item was tabled to the next meeting.

#### Planning Board Associate Member – Vacancy

Point of information.

#### Planning Board Concerns

R. Forst indicted he is upset with the removal of the trees on Hill Street (Lot 2 & Lot 3) that was brought to the attention of the Planning Board by email from an abutter. B. Massey explained to Mr. Forst that the trees in question were on private property and were not considered public shade trees, noting the approval(s) from the Planning Board did not restrict or prevent the removal of those trees. Mr. Forst stated he was not happy.

#### Mail – Review

In addition to the mail listed (attached) the Planning Board noted receipt of the following communications: Planning Board Agenda dated November 10, 2020; Draft Planning Board Agenda dated November 24, 2020; Citizen's Forum Document; Public Hearing Notice for 342-350 Providence Road; Letter dated June 24, 2020 to Town Planner from Land Planning, Inc. regarding 342-350 Providence Road; Site Plan Review Application dated June 19, 2020 regarding 342-350 Providence Road, LLC; Site Plan dated 04/07/2020 from Land Planning, Inc. for 342-350 Providence Rd.; Sediment & Erosion Control plan dated 06/11/2020 from Land Planning, Inc. for 342-350 Providence Rd.; Site Plan Apartment Expansion dated 10/13/2020 from Land Planning, Inc. for 342-350 Providence Road; Letter to Planning Board from Fire Department regarding 342-350 Providence Road; Letter dated October 22, 2020 to Town Planner from Building Inspector regarding 342-350 Providence Road; Letter dated October 26, 2020 to Town Planner from Whitinsville Water Company regarding 342-350 Providence Road; Memo dated October 29, 2020 to Town Planner from Conservation Agent concerning 342-350 Providence Road; Memo dated October 29, 2020 to Town Planner from Director of Public Works & Town Engineer regarding 342-350 Providence Road; Draft Safety Committee Minutes dated October 14, 2020; Email dated October 15, 2020 to Planning Board from Tom Quinn regarding 342-350 Providence Road; Letter dated November 02, 2020 to Planning Board from Turning Point Engineering concerning the Camelot Minor Subdivision Modification; The Camelot Layout Plan showing the modification areas; Site Visit Report dated October 15, 2020 concerning The Camelot Phases 2 & 3; Draft Planning Board Minutes of September 22, 2020; Draft Planning Board Minutes of October 13, 2020; Email dated October 14, 2020 to Town Planner from CMRPC regarding Digital Submission Standard Language; Email dated October 21, 2020 to Town Planner from Beth Ellen Stanley concerning 10 Watson Farm Road with portion of assessor map showing property; Email dated October 29, 2020 JM Grenier Associates from Town Planner regarding Mike's Way Mass DOT Permit & Cutting Plan; Mike's Way Roadway Cut Plan dated October 22, 2020; Letter dated November 02, 2020 to Planning Board from Turning Point Engineering concerning Leonardo Estates Subdivision request for minor subdivision modification; Leonardo Estates conceptual lot grading plan dated



August 13, 2013; Petition to eliminate sidewalks at Leonardo Estates; Letter dated August 31, 2020 to Planning Board from Graves Engineering, Inc. regarding Leonardo Estates Engineer's Opinion Construction Estimate; Letter dated August 2020 to Planning Board and Board of Selectmen from CMRPC concerning Appointment of Delegates and Alternate to CMRPC for Fiscal Year 2021; Email dated October 21, 2020 to Rene Geis from Town Planner regarding Construction Schedule for Moon Hill Estates; Site Visit Report dated October 23, 2020 for Stone Hill Condominiums; Site Visit Report dated October 23, 2020 for Presidential Farms, Phase V; Site Visit Report dated October 26, 2020 for Presidential Farms, Phase V; Draft Planning Board Meeting Schedule for 2021; Community Planning & Development Weekly Report October 12-16, 2020; Community Planning & Development Weekly Report October 18-23, 2020; Community Planning & Development Weekly Report October 25-30, 2020; Community Planning & Development Weekly Report November 02-06, 2020; Planning Board Schedule of Meeting Dates 2020.

#### Other

G. Bechtholdt explained that the YATCO gas station/Dunkin' Donuts Conditions of Approval states that if necessary, the Planning Board may require a follow-up traffic study. The Planning Board discussed if the traffic study was needed. There were several comments that it is a great design with no traffic concerns, very nice looking aesthetically, and very clean. The Planning Board will not have them do a traffic study at this time. Planning Board reviewed agenda items for the next scheduled meeting and the possibility of canceling the December 22, 2020 meeting.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Having no additional business, the Planning Board adjourned its meeting of November 10, 2020 at or about 9:55PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Approved by the Planning Board:

  
Barbara A. Kinney  
Planning Administrative Assistant



Cc: Town Clerk  
/File