



TOWN OF NORTHBOROUGH PLANNING BOARD

Town Hall Offices • 63 Main Street • Northborough, MA 01532 • 508-393-5019 • 508-393-6996 Fax

Planning Board Approved on 5-19-09

Planning Board/Zoning Board of Appeals Joint Meeting Minutes March 17, 2009

Planning Board Members present: Rick Leif, George Pember, Michelle Gillespie, Daniel Lewis, Bob Rosenberg

ZBA Members Present: Dick Rand, Gerry Benson, Dan Ginsberg

Others Present: Kathy Joubert, Town Planner; Bill Farnsworth, Zoning Enforcement Officer/Inspector of Buildings; Jim & Gigi Casella, Jackie Wellman, Maggie Harling, Jodie Martinson, Sandra Chaurette, Igor Achkinazi, John Fouracre, Millard Berryman, Keith Lane

Chairman Leif opened the Planning Board meeting at 7:00 pm.

Chairman Rand opened the ZBA meeting at 7:00 pm.

Use Regulations and Environmental Performance Standards

Mr. Leif stated he, Mr. Rosenberg and Mark Donahue worked together last week on the performance standards. They are in the current bylaw but are not included in the proposed bylaw and some members are not happy with that.

Mr. Leif confirmed for Mr. Rand that Mr. Donahue, as chairman of the Industrial Development Committee (IDC), has been speaking on the committee's behalf because they meet so infrequently. They did not talk about the IDC reviewing it. It needs to be reviewed amongst the Planning Board members and final wording needs to be ready for next Monday.

Ms. Gillespie stated they should be discussing industrial standards with the IDC.

7-05-040, Use Regulations - Changes in the proposed version by Rick Leif, Bob Rosenberg and Mark Donahue were reviewed and voted on as follows:

B (1): Applicability: Proposed to add the wording in bold "an industrial district or an industrial use in any other district"

Vote: 6 members in favor, 4 opposed.

Ms. Joubert noted the definition of industrial use is on pages 35 & 36 of the February draft.

C. Noise: Proposed to add wording in bold as follows: "With respect to industrial uses having an impact on residential uses, the sound due to the operations of the facility, measured at the property line of the facility, shall not be increased over the ambient sound level by more than 5 decibels weighted for the "A" scale [dB (A)]. The ambient sound level is the sound from all sources other than the subject facility. The ambient sound measurement (A-weighted sound level) is taken where the offending sound cannot

be heard, or with the sound source shut-off. The ambient sound level is the level that is exceeded 90% of the time that the noise measurements are taken.”

Vote: All members were in favor of this change.

Mr. Leif stated they had wanted to regulate noise as it affects a residential use. The original wording did not provide a way to measure it. Working with Mr. Donahue they came up with the addition to C. It is a more stringent version of the standard DEP

D. Recombinant DA (RDNA): Proposed to be deleted.

Vote: 7 in favor of deleting with 2 members abstaining

Mr. Leif noted it is unclear how this will be measured and unlikely it would be going on in Northborough. The agreement was that it shouldn't be in Performance Standards and that if there is an issue the Board of Health will regulate it.

E. Stormwater Management and Erosion Control: Proposed to be deleted.

Vote: 7 members in favor of deleting with 2 members abstaining.

Mr. Leif noted it is already handled by a new bylaw adapted at 2008 Town Meeting, so there are rules in place and it would be confusing to have it in another section of the bylaw too.

F. Solid Waste Storage: Proposed to delete current proposed wording through “lot lines” and add (in bold) “Exposed storage areas shall be screened from the view of abutting properties” and streets in accordance with Section 7-09-20(c) of this bylaw.

Mr. Leif stated the proposal is intended to require exposed storage areas to be screened from the street and this is for industrial use, not commercial or retail.

Mr. Rosenberg stated this refers to any outside storage areas and it is basically the situation under current zoning.

Mr. Pember confirmed it was aimed at businesses that store equipment and/or merchandise outside.

Mr. Farnsworth stated it was and will be impossible to screen them from those around the business and is very broad. He noted it would require industrial uses to be screened from each other.

Ms. Joubert confirmed they are not talking about dumpsters but about outside products. They originally talked about compactors and dumpsters. Outdoor storage is allowed in certain areas. If they want storage areas screened from abutters, it should be for industrial uses abutting residential areas.

Mr. Lewis suggested changing it back to solid waste storage, which accomplished the main point.

Mr. Leif stated that by returning wording as it was before, it takes care of solid waste. The question is the level of screening for the other types of storage and is more critical when industrial abuts residential.

Mr. Farnsworth stated the original wording was enforceable. He questioned how it is offensive to even residential abutters if they're talking about storage of their products. He explained

that sometimes residential areas sit higher than industrial sites and so the industrial site can be seen from above. He questioned how it would be screened.

Ms. Joubert asked if the proposed screening on page 85 under Site Plan Review takes care of it. If so, it doesn't need to be in performance standards.

John Fouracre, 99 Pleasant Street, stated the industrial areas are designed to be industrial and originally there were no residential areas around them. Now residential has encroached on them and residential is being protected from industrial. He questioned why they are concerned about residential when the industrial area was set aside with no residential involvement, for example, originally there was no housing on Lyman Street or Whitney Street. He asked why they would be protecting residential property. Nothing is fenced in on Whitney Street except Isometrix. This is an important issue with industrial areas.

Ms. Joubert asked if the purpose is to reflect what's in the site plan.

Mr. Rosenberg replied it wasn't and that they didn't recognize it was in the site plan approval process. It would come into play when applying it to new uses and expanding uses.

Ms. Joubert stated it's in the proposed bylaw today and asked Mr. Rosenberg if he wanted it to be cross-referenced or to have it somewhere else in the bylaw.

Mr. Rosenberg stated it belongs in 7-9-020.

Vote: 7 members in favor of deleting with 2 members abstaining.

G. Lighting: Proposed to delete G (2) (a) and (b).

Vote: 6 members in favor of deleting, 2 members opposed, 1 member abstained.

Mr. Leif stated this gives the Planning Board the ability to review lighting. G (1) states outdoor lighting will be shielded and directed away from a residential district and that once lighting is resolved on the plan it should stay that way.

H. Miscellaneous Standards: Proposed to delete H (1), (3), (8), (9) and (10).

Mr. Leif stated these tie into state regulations and those stricken out did not have some kind of state or federal way to handle it.

Mr. Benson asked if they just aren't restating that applicants have to conform to state regulations.

Mr. Leif stated they thought it was worthy to restate it so applicant would know they have to adhere to them. It also says if they apply for Site Plan Review they'll have to state how they will comply with these regulations.

Mr. Benson stated he doesn't understand why it needs to be said again.

Mr. Farnsworth stated they are providing information to the Special Permit Granting Authority (SPGA) and a lot of people don't know how they're going to address them because they don't have the finished plan yet. They won't know how they'll be in compliance.

Mr. Leif stated they thought the SPGA should have the ability to put the topic on the table for discussion.

Vote: 6 members in favor of deleting, 2 members opposed, 1 member abstained

I. Compliance: Proposed to delete the words:

(1) “**site plan review**” from first line and “**Planning Board or the**”, and “**as applicable**” from the third line.

(2) “**at the applicant’s expense**” from second and third line and “**and may, in connection therewith, and at the applicant’s expense, obtain expert advise as necessary to review the plans and proposals of the applicant**” from the fourth line to the end of the paragraph.

Ms. Joubert asked why they had deleted site plan review in I (1).

Mr. Leif stated under Site Plan Review for uses allowed by right the function of the SPGA is basically to make sure the design of the site is done reasonably. To bring into effect all these situations is not part of site plan review. A lot of questions need to be asked.

Mr. Farnsworth stated the state building code mandates the site plan review. It has to be done anyway. Safeguards are still there.

Mr. Leif stated they wanted the board to have the ability to review these situations.

Mr. Farnsworth stated they’re asking for information the applicants wouldn’t have until the final design is ready. Also, the owner might not know what the use is going to be at the time of the site plan review.

Mr. Leif stated they talked about gray areas. It reserves the right of the SPGA to review the project.

Mr. Pember stated Mr. Farnsworth is advocating enforcement during the time of the Certificate of Occupancy. No matter what is done at the permit level, a certificate of occupancy won’t be issued until the state building code is met.

Mr. Farnsworth stated generally most of the time applicants don’t know these things until they get further on, closer to applying for a building or occupancy permit. Sometimes there’s a year difference from the site plan review. He stated the procedure under I (2) is the way it’s generally done.

Mr. Pember stated he’s heard from people that Northborough is not friendly to business because there are too many rules and regulations and the boards are tough. Now it’s proposed to require someone to pay an engineer to go through a detailed analysis before that person is even remotely ready for an occupancy permit and then at the time the occupancy permit has been applied for, Mr. Farnsworth has to inspect the site anyway. He questioned why this is being done and why they would not want to encourage the growth of the town’s tax base.

Mr. Leif stated they are only proposing this for industrial use not allowed by right. Uses specially permitted need more review. He wanted the board to be able to ask more questions and the applicant to present a plan to the building inspector special conditions attached.

Ms. Joubert read the list of uses subject to special permit in the industrial district on page 25 of the February 25th zoning draft.

Mr. Pember asked Mr. Benson if he felt this is an unnecessary additional step.

Mr. Benson stated it's just repeating the requirements that will be enforced later on. Its things allowed by right they may be concerned about.

Mr. Rosenberg stated not only do they have to meet those regulations, but it involves considering those for site plan review.

Mr. Benson stated whether the words toxic and use are there are not, it has to be regulated. He doesn't know what they're gaining with the language.

Ms. Gillespie stated she struggled with noise.

Mr. Benson stated noise is a little different and everything else is out. The other things are enforced by other agencies.

Ms. Gillespie stated noise is consistent and all agreed it's a duplication of efforts for everything else. It was agreed upon in October.

Mr. Leif stated specially permitted applications need to have the extra level of review through the process. He doesn't view it as something that causes additional problems.

Mr. Pember stated it's a road block to the application because it causes more expense and time.

Mr. Ginsberg asked if the building inspector says it doesn't make sense at the time of the application, could it be waived.

Mr. Leif stated it allows the SPGA to raise questions about these issues if they're appropriate. It provides a way to have someone look at it other than the building inspector. To remove it for the sake of streamlining the process, they would lose the ability to raise these questions.

Ms. Gillespie stated if the applicant is not ready to provide information, the Planning Board reserves the right to review the project once the applicant is ready.

Mr. Leif stated they are trying to protect the interests of the town. Michelle - if applicant not ready to provide information, PB reserves the right to review once applicant is ready.

Ms. Gillespie stated it gives the board the ability to have a discussion but not to deny it.

Mr. Rosenberg stated it provides for saying it has to be submitted. He asked about this in relation to special permits.

Ms. Joubert read the criteria for issuing a special permit on page 9, C, 1-7 of the proposed zoning, which is what the SPGA can consider when issuing a special permit.

Ms. Gillespie asked Mr. Rosenberg if this addresses his concerns. She stated it's basically an allowed use with conditions. She asked him if he feels, under these criteria, that this information could be asked for.

Mr. Leif stated they reviewed them together and that this was a way to manage the process without overly encumbering it.

Ms. Joubert stated the only difference is the performance standards say “shall”.

Mr. Rosenberg asked at what point they determine what “proper operations” are. They have relied on existing standards and noise. The SPGA needs to be able to request this information. If the information is not obtainable or irrelevant, perhaps they attach it as a condition that it comes back for the file and is ready for Mr. Farnsworth as he has to approve it anyway.

Mr. Benson stated it depends on the application and the proposed uses. Things under miscellaneous are all related to existing regulations. Things that were struck out pertain to best management questions, which are still going to be asked even though they’re not in there.

Mr. Leif stated Mr. Donahue’s perspective was that it was starting with by-right applications and not the point of the board to ask those questions.

Mr. Benson stated a host of things come up during site plan review. He wouldn’t want to give a list that could be perceived as the only things they’re going to review.

Mr. Leif stated there are two points - the list in site plan review and after-the-fact management of the site.

Mr. Farnsworth stated I (1) refers to an application for a special permit for use or for a special permit with site plan review. The wording now proposed says that this only applies to an application for a special permit for use. He encouraged the members to mean what they say and say what they mean because he has to enforce the wording.

Mr. Leif stated the assumption is that industrial applications are going to be for special permit site plan review.

Mr. Farnsworth stated there are cases where it’s a change in use, with the building and site already established. The way it’s proposed to read right now is that they have to do a lot of things that aren’t part of the change in use.

Mr. Lewis stated when F. Solid Waste Storage is deleted the real problem is I. Compliance. It repeats what is said elsewhere. If 1 and 3 are stricken, 2 gives Mr. Farnsworth the opportunity to ask for more information.

Mr. Leif stated they could do that, but then at the time of the SPGA review it couldn’t be brought up.

Mr. Lewis and Mr. Benson said it could be brought up but it might not be available.

Mr. Leif stated it’s a way to clarify what the expectation is. He doesn’t see it as putting something more on the applicant.

Mr. Farnsworth asked about groundwater. Groundwater says now you need a special permit.

Mr. Leif stated they want to make it clear that the SPGA has the ability to ask about these things.

Mr. Rand stated he agrees with Mr. Pember that this is a roadblock to industrial development and not effective at all.

Mr. Lewis suggested just including #2.

Mr. Rand stated Mr. Farnsworth doesn't need a reminder.

Mr. Lewis stated there will be a time when Mr. Farnsworth isn't here.

Mr. Rosenberg asked on what basis the Planning Board decides what is adequate and appropriate.

Ms. Joubert stated on page 9 the applicant has to submit information, whether initially or not, or the Planning Board can require additional information of the applicant.

Mr. Rosenberg asked what defines proper operation of the use.

Ms. Joubert stated the board does.

Mr. Benson suggested they may want to add that whatever use is applied for will comply with best management practices and allows you to ask questions of anything associated with the use.

Mr. Rosenberg asked why Mr. Benson says that's being done today.

Mr. Farnsworth stated requirements for variances and special permits are listed in the packages he provides to applicants and he explains it to the applicants. If they don't provide the information they take the risk it will delay their process. It's a standard instruction sheet.

Mr. Rosenberg stated that's not zoning, that's a form. He questioned how this proposal differs from the fact that they have performance standards and are currently required to submit this information. All these things are part of the process right now, but the proposed zoning is proposing to get rid of all that and then they'll come up with some definition of proper operations outside of any performance standards.

Mr. Farnsworth stated it's been required for special permit site plan review for the past 15 years and questioned if they've ever gotten all that information. He stated that's why they're reviewing the bylaw.

Mr. Rosenberg stated that without performance standards they don't have a definition of proper operation.

Ms. Joubert stated it's the compliance section that's the question. Part of the compliance section was copied out of the existing bylaw by Judi Barrett. Item 1 in Compliance is almost verbatim and then items 2 and 3 are new. Ms. Joubert read from page 58 of the current bylaw.

Mr. Leif stated they're making it less stringent in the newly proposed version.

Revised Draft dated March 17, 2009, Use Regulations

I. Industrial Uses

Ms. Gillespie asked what hasn't been resolved with Mr. Donahue yet.

Mr. Leif stated it's the last page (page 33), Revised Draft dated March 17, 2009, Industrial Uses. It defines generally what light manufacturing is and defines criteria that need to be met for light manufacturing. The current zoning proposed did not include conditions for research and development.

Mr. Pember stated he is in favor of what was suggested but, as far as outside storage and Mr. Farnsworth comments, he thinks they are denying some companies the ability to do light manufacturing by prohibiting the outside storage.

Mr. Farnsworth agreed with Mr. Pember.

Mr. Leif stated he and Mr. Rosenberg added I. industrial Uses after a phone discussion with Mr. Donahue.

Mr. Rosenberg stated they talked about eliminating site plan review, but gave it defined uses and didn't need it.

Mr. Farnsworth confirmed that, referring to #2 in bold, they are restricting them to only using electric or noiseless and inoffensive power.

Mr. Rosenberg asked where they would be headed for power.

Mr. Farnsworth stated what they use inside can't be heard outside.

Dick Kane came to the meeting at 8:30 pm.

Ms. Gillespie asked if, rather than voting on the changes as one document, they could break it up into different parts. All agreed they need provisions for noise, but then there were concerns about miscellaneous standards, compliance and industrial uses. They need to decide what they want by going through the list. These can be edited and changed up to town meeting. She had hoped the Industrial Development Committee (IDC) could work on this for a year but since this was rushed and our backs are up against the wall, she'd like to do it in a way that it won't hurt industrial uses they want and if the need to, they can always add something in next year. It's a work in progress.

Mr. Rosenberg stated he is opposed to each piece being done separately, given that what mattered was input and approval from Mark Donahue and that was done. This is a matter of the Planning Board's function, ultimately.

Ms. Gillespie stated she disagrees, that it involves all boards and they heard the building inspector say what he can do and what he can't. She stated she never said anything about Mr. Donahue's approval, but thought the IDC should give their approval. Every board member here is doing this for the betterment of the community, not just Mr. Rosenberg and Mr. Leif.

Mr. Leif stated they can vote on it.

Vote on having performance standards: 5 in favor, 4 opposed

Vote on Noise performance standards: All in favor

Jodie Martinson, 50 Coolidge Circle noted the votes included both boards and asked about the outcome.

Mr. Leif stated for this process, they have always taken the input from both boards for what they're going to bring to town meeting. Rick - both boards - joint input

Mr. Rosenberg stated it will eventually be the Planning Board's vote alone on whether to recommend this at town meeting.

Ms. Martinson asked if it would be all or nothing at town meeting.

Mr. Leif stated it would.

Ms. Martinson stated if there are things some people don't like, it will kill the whole thing if they vote against it. She stated she is stunned that performance standards will be eliminated after 40 years.

Mr. Farnsworth stated the regulations are out there being enforced.

Zoning Districts

Those present reviewed 4 corrected proposed zoning maps. The map for the southwest area was unavailable.

Downtown Neighborhood District

Ms. Joubert stated they need to vote on changes made from comments at the first community meeting on February 25th. The Downtown Neighborhood District is now called the Downtown Business District.

Mr. Rosenberg stated that they voted at a recent meeting to take Lynn and Rick Tucker's house out of the district. Also, regarding the purple peninsula in the upper right, the current district line remains RC. This was voted a month ago.

Regarding split lots, Ms. Joubert explained to John Fouracre, 99 Pleasant Street, that if a business person sells his property and the use is pre-existing, non-conforming, the use will be grandfathered according the Mass General Law. If the proposed zoning passes and Walgreen's decides they want to locate at the Northboro Automotive site, they would have to apply for a variance, but the same use would be grandfathered.

The rest of the changes on the map were reviewed.

Business B West

The original map did not have St. Rose of Lima's church in the business district. It was suggested by staff and agreed that the church operates as a business and should be in the business district in case they wanted to develop further.

Ms. Joubert stated the Post Office was added in after the last meeting. The Maney parcel is a split lot. The line was pulled back at the last meeting.

Mr. Lewis stated the Bigelow parcel in the business district is another case where it would make sense to leave a portion in Business West and make the rest Residential B.

Southwest Area

Ms. Joubert explained the changes made in 2007 involved land swaps between Robert Kimball and Kevin Giblin, so the industrial district moved north to follow lot lines. It was reviewed by the engineer who did the plan for the town originally. Some older maps show those as Residential B (RB), which is incorrect because it would put The Loop in the RB district. To the left is the Borgatti property, the Bigelow property, land owned by the State and land owned by the town.

Mr. Rosenberg stated he had made a request about his concern for the Highway Business District, which is the only district where adult uses are allowed. It is a very well-defined area. As a community we have to allow it someplace and need to control it to keep it from becoming a burden on the community. He would like to be careful in strategy to manage the adult district. One of the tools is that it must be 1000 feet from a church or school - a 1000-foot umbrella from a bunch of points - so that generally once a community has an adult use area they are down to one or two parcels where it could be located. It is defined in this area. Six parcels in the industrial district couldn't be adult use under current zoning. If they give up that zoning, they may give up that protection of those areas. It is required by federal law to have some place for adult use in the community and the town followed the standard that has a court precedent. A ramification of putting residential up there is that the umbrella is thrown away.

Ms. Joubert stated adult uses are only allowed in Business South.

Mr. Rosenberg stated that with the umbrellas they can't be located in those 6 parcels. They don't have to make it easy. They are basically eliminating part of structure that the adult use bylaw was based on.

Ms. Joubert noted it's a good thing because they're moving the residential area farther away.

Mr. Rosenberg stated he is concerned about maintaining the limit where it can be located in town. They don't want to eliminate any of their constraints on adult use.

Mr. Leif stated that by pulling the residential line north it takes away a buffer that exists that eliminates where it can go.

Mr. Lewis stated that for landowners it creates a funny situation. There's one split lot, there's a pond there (Smith Pond) and a buffer around a body of water.

Mr. Leif stated extending the residential zone doesn't take away any ability to use the land.

Mr. Pember requested that if they did that, could an argument be made that the only adult uses could be located south of Route 9 and south of the inbound ramp.

Ms. Joubert stated Westborough zoning prohibits them along Route 9.

Mr. Pember asked if the town has prohibited anyone from having an adult use.

Ms. Joubert stated it's written so that it's the only use. Another area does not need to be designated because they've already designated an area. Town Counsel had to change the language when reviewing the February 25th draft from the Attorney General. She noted the mini-golf business will be leaving.

Mr. Rosenberg stated all uses can change. The key to that piece is that it will always be residential until it's changed (talking about the parcel with the pond). Both sides of the divider are water.

Mr. Lewis noted the next parcel could be affected.

Mr. Leif stated if the adult use changes, they'll locate it on another lot on Route 9 and the position of the store on the lot is going to be facing the road so where that other store would be in relation to the residential neighborhood isn't going to change whether the zone line is changed or not.

Mr. Rosenberg stated that if that business closed, they could end up with no adult use. As the zoning is right now, if that store went out of business and became a coffee shop, we would have eliminated adult uses from highway under current zoning.

Approve as is or return residential or could approve with one parcel change

Mr. Pember motioned to accept as is with the exception of one parcel, and making that parcel Residential C. Mr. Rosenberg seconded the motion and the vote was 8 members in favor, 1 member opposed (Dan Lewis). Mr. Lewis stated he is against creating a funny little parcel.

Southwest Map Acceptance: Mr. Ginsberg motioned that the board accept the previous change to this map, Ms. Gillespie seconded and all members were in favor.

Adult Day Care

Ms. Joubert stated adult day care is not an exempt use as child day care is in Massachusetts. It is not allowed unless a town specifically allows it someplace. Adult Day Care in the new zoning is listed as an accessory use to an assisted living facility. Assisted living facilities are allowed by special permit in the DB, BE, and BW districts. It is not a typical use in a residential zone. It has to be licensed. Ms. Barrett's suggestion is to allow it as a stand-alone by special permit in all districts where assisted living is allowed except in residential. It would be a prohibited use in the residential districts and in Main Street residential.

Mr. Rosenberg stated another scenario is that of the Association of Retarded Citizens where they provide a day program and they generally have vans in and out of the facility bringing people there for the day and home in the evening.

Mr. Farnsworth stated that's a different classification.

Ms. Joubert stated there is one in Hudson and the people's needs are so specialized it's usually 4 - 5 individuals, not 20 - 30 people.

Mr. Farnsworth stated his office has had calls for people who want to do it in their house for adults to come for a few hours a day.

Mr. Benson stated they could allow it in all the business districts.

Ms. Joubert stated the subject was raised by Kelly Burke, Senior Center Director, and Jeff Leland from the Council on Aging. The question/request was to look at it if there was time for it. The suggestion is for it to be by special permit in the business district, mirroring where assisted living is allowed by right, but not in residential districts. A stand-alone day care is not allowed in a residential district.

All members voted in favor of the Downtown Business District, Business East, Business West, Highway District, and Industrial District.

Old/New Business

Meeting Dates: The public hearing for the proposed zoning will be held on April 7, 2009 and the taping of the cable TV show will be on April 8, 2009.

Mr. Leif stated if anyone wants to participate in the cable show, they should email Kathy with anything they'd like them to talk about.

Regarding retail drive-throughs and gas stations, Mr. Rosenberg will give Ms. Joubert the dates and she will confirm in the June 24th minutes.

Mr. Rosenberg stated one thing in the use table needs to be clarified. The definition of hospital, medical clinic and ambulatory surgery center needs to be split into 2 distinct uses. There's a single definition but the uses are allowed in different zones. He referred to section 7-04-020, Page 28.

Mr. Lewis stated in the table on page 51, the maximum front setback in the GR district is 15 feet minimum and 30 feet maximum. With those requirements, the house couldn't be set back further than 30 feet. He suggested eliminating the maximum setback. He stated the maximum setback in BB East and BB West may result in some unintended consequences. He would like to eliminate them now and then they could be voted back in, although they were already voted in. He recognizes the concern is with having the main street look better, but he suggests this may not do it and there may be some unexpected consequences.

Mr. Rosenberg referred to stormwater runoff on page 83, stated it should be changed to chapter 4-12, illicit discharge.

Ms. Gillespie motioned to adjourn, Mr. Pember seconded the motion and the meeting adjourned at 10:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Grampietro
Board Secretary