



4. If any road signs need to be removed/replaced or relocated for this project, the applicant will be responsible for removing/replacing or relocating said signs in accordance with approval from the Sutton Highway Department.
5. Prior to issuance of sign permits the applicant shall submit any sign details not shown on the Site Plan to the Planning Department. Said submittal shall be reviewed and acted on in compliance with the Sign Bylaw
6. The applicant shall provide a fence, as shown on the site plan, along the western lot line in the location requested by direct abutter.
7. Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy the Applicant shall submit to the Planning Board an As-Built Plan and written certification from the project's engineer that the site has been constructed substantially in accordance with the Site Plan.
8. The Board reserves the right to review and adjust lighting within a year of initial illumination and require adjustments and/or additions if they find it to be a danger or nuisance.
9. The Board reserves the right to review landscaping within 6 months of installation and require additional planting to achieve intended screening.
10. The Applicant shall ensure proper maintenance of plantings on the site, including replacement of dead or diseased plantings in the following planting season.
11. The owner of the Site shall arrange for semi-annual inspections of the Site drainage and oil separation systems. A written report shall be prepared by the inspector, including any required correction actions to be taken, such report to be submitted to the Planning Department within fourteen business days of owner's receipt of the report. Any required correction actions shall be promptly implemented by the owner at its expense.
12. There shall be NO outdoor storage of materials or equipment on this site.
13. Prior to leasing or re-leasing any tenant space written correspondence shall be submitted to the Planning Department for approval. The Department will deny new tenant requests if there is not adequate parking for the current tenant mix or the use does not qualify under the use special permits granted.
14. Hours of operation shall be no earlier than 7 AM and no later than 7 PM Monday through Friday and 8 AM to 2 PM on Weekends unless the Board changes this condition for a specific user through a public hearing process.
15. An advance warning sign shall be installed east bound to warn of traffic from this site entering Whitins Road. The applicant shall also work with the Highway, Police and Planning Departments to make adjustments to the stone wall and/or grades to the west of the site drive to improve sight distance. These items shall be accomplished prior to start of earth removal from the site.

2<sup>nd</sup>: S. Paul  
 Vote: 5-0-0

Motion: To close the public hearing, R. Largess  
 2<sup>nd</sup>: W. Baker  
 Vote: 5-0-0

**Public Hearing – Proposed Bylaw Changes**

R. Largess read the hearing notice as it appeared in The Chronicle, The Board waived reading of the detailed changes in lieu of reading the notice of each change as each one is brought up for discussion.

**Recreational Marijuana – Articles 15-19**

Jen Hager, Planning Director explained that this hearing is solely to discuss recreational marijuana. She noted personal growing and use of marijuana is allowed under state law and the community cannot enact local regulations that affect this right.

She added medical marijuana cannot be prohibited either, but can be regulated and last year Sutton voters adopted medical marijuana regulations and designated South Sutton Commerce Park as Sutton's Medical Marijuana Overlay District (MMOD) where this use may be located.

Tonight's hearing is to discuss the Town's options for regulation of recreational (aka non-medical or adult use) marijuana establishments. She went through a brief presentation that detailed the types of recreational marijuana establishments: cultivation, production, transport, testing, research, retail and on site consumption establishments. The presentation also laid out the three choices residents have on this issue as follows:

1. Prohibit all types of recreational marijuana establishments in Sutton
2. Prohibit some and allow other types of recreational marijuana establishments in Sutton
3. Do nothing – This choice will allow all the above uses to locate wherever similar uses are currently allowed

With respect to Option 1 she stated Town Counsel recommends if a full prohibition is preferred, it should be added to both the Zoning and General Bylaw this is why there are two identical articles one for each bylaw.

Option 2 proposes to allow cultivation, production, transport, testing, research, but prohibit retail and on site consumption establishments. Allowed uses would only be allowed within the proposed Marijuana Business Overlay District (MBOD), which is the same location as the MMOD.

With respect to Option 3 she stressed that while the law and related regulations have not been tested to date as no permits will be issued until July 1<sup>st</sup>, the prevailing opinion is that cultivation is potentially problematic in communities like Sutton where agriculture is allowed in the majority of Town. It is entirely possible that cultivation facilities could locate in areas where agriculture is an allowed use. As cultivation facilities have to be enclosed secure facilities that range in size from a few thousand feet to one proposed at 1 million square feet, this would of course not be ideal.

She noted if either Option 1 or Option 2 fail to get a 2/3rds vote at Town Meeting, it will be the same as if the Town chose to do nothing, which would not be a good situation.

Robert Maki of 15 Dewitt Road asked if anyone is interested in this use? J. Hager noted one potential application has approached the Selectmen for a letter of non-opposition for a medical cultivation facility in the MMOD and they have expressed the desire to also grow recreational marijuana as well.

Will Marquis of 37 Trilliam Run asked if there is a down side to full prohibition in terms of risk of a lawsuit. J. Hager stated no there is no risk of legal consequences with total prohibition as the law was written to allow communities to choose. Additionally, the related articles have been reviewed by Town Counsel.

Ghassan Black of 9 Dewitt Road asked about potential revenue. J. Hager stated the law is written so Towns can get up to 3% of sales from retail establishments and up to this amount from other establishments. It is up to the Selectmen when negotiating the host community agreement what this amount is actually fixed at for the five-year term of the agreement. After five years the market may have changed, or other circumstances and the number can change in year six moving forward. It is also not an absolute given that the Town will receive 3% as the law says the amount of money the Town receives is supposed to have some relation to the cost to the community of hosting a use. In general, the amounts negotiated in host community agreement have gone down over the past few years and now average \$25,000 to \$150,000 per year depending on the size/production of the facility.

Robert Nunnemacher of 24 Singletary Avenue said any decision to allow this use should not be based on revenue as revenue often does not turn out to be what was projected. He stated he is against any recreational marijuana establishments.

Ted Beauvais of 34 Armsy Road stated he is in favor of a partial prohibition that allows cultivation, particularly for the potential employment opportunities it offers.

The Board read a letter from Beth Weidman of 94 Barnett Road into the record. She expressed her opposition to recreational marijuana establishments stating she believes it sends the wrong message to the youth of the community.

S. Paul expressed serious concerns with the inability to get a 2/3rds vote on either article. He noted the sincere split of the community on State ballot Question 4 that was nearly a 50/50 vote. He wondered why the partial prohibition should not be considered first? J. Hager noted when voting regulations that amount to choices, you usually vote the most restrictive first and if that doesn't pass, the fall back is the less restrictive option.

Generally, the Board felt either option was palatable, and that the community via their vote at Town Meeting should decide which option was most appropriate for Sutton. Therefore, they voted to support both articles as follows, but stressed the need that one or the other achieve a 2/3rds vote as a failed attempt or doing nothing is not an acceptable risk.

Motion: To recommend Town Meeting vote to approve Articles 15 & 16 with Article 17 as a fall back, R. Largess  
 2<sup>nd</sup>: W. Baker  
 Vote: 5-0-0

Motion: To recommend Town Meeting approve Article 17 with Articles 15/16 as a fall back, R. Largess  
 2<sup>nd</sup>: W. Baker  
 Vote: 5-0-0

Article 18 is a housekeeping article to show within the Use Table permitted and prohibited marijuana uses. Should Articles 15 & 16 pass (as opposed to article 17), the Board will need to present an amendment to the article removing the footnote from beside Items #2-4 and adjusting the name of the overlay district back to Medical Marijuana Overlay District (MMOD) within the footnote. If the article does not pass the uses will still otherwise be permitted as they exist in other provisions of the bylaw, this just produces more transparency.

Motion: To recommend that Town Meeting approve Article 18 as is if Article 17 passes, and with removal of the footnote and change to the District name if Articles 15/16 pass R. Largess  
 2<sup>nd</sup>: W. Baker  
 Vote: 5-0-0

Article 19 is a recommendation of Town Counsel. They have stated there is no harm in enacting this regulation to be prepared in case retail uses are ever allowed, as opposed to forgetting to do this at that time which would negate the ability to collect this extra revenue.

Motion: To recommend Town Meeting approve Article 19, M. Sanderson  
 2<sup>nd</sup>: R. Largess  
 Vote: 5-0-0

Article 22 – To add approx. 138 acres at 15 Dewitt Road to the Solar Photovoltaic Overlay District. Mr. Robert Maki, the petitioner and landowner, was present to request the Board add his land at 15 Dewitt Road to the solar overlay. He stated he felt the project as proposed would have little impact. The term of operation is 25 years with two 5 year extensions.

J. Hager explained towns cannot prohibit solar installations, but they can say what size of system should be allowed where. In 2011 the Town voted to allow systems of 250kw or less, about an acre of panels, in all zoning districts and systems larger than this were restricted to business and industrial districts. Last year land owners adjacent to Route 146 off Purgatory Road wanted to build a system that was larger than the 250kw, so they filed a citizens petition to create the Solar Overlay and add their land into the district. An overlay district is a tool in the Massachusetts zoning toolbox. Overlay Districts are typically created with a specific purpose statement and the districts are placed over existing static zoning to allow for uses that are not normally allowed within the underlying district but which maybe appropriate if they meeting the purpose of the district and comply with regulations that are usually set up for the specific overlay. Town Meeting voted in favor of creating the overlay and adding the Purgatory Road parcel into the district and the three petitioners this evening are asking to also add their land into this same overlay district. Overlay Districts allow residents to pick and choose areas where additional specific uses may or may not be appropriate.

Barry Schulty, P.E. from ProTech Energy, the consultant for this development reviewed a conceptual plan. The company is located in Worcester and they have built about 25 installations in Massachusetts, and 50 total ground systems in the 5 years they have been in business. He stated their company is different from many in that they build the systems they permit, often own them, and always maintain them. He stressed they do not go away, if any type of issues develop they are there to immediately address issues. He noted the current plan is conceptual, they will not do detailed engineering unless the Town votes they can move forward.

The proposed project is a 5 MW system covering approximately 30 acres of the Maki land with utility and access easements out to Dewitt Road. The system is ground mounted to an angled height of 10°. The ground cleared for panels is over-seeded with a low growing meadow mix. The limit of disturbance will be over 400' from the nearest residence. The growth in this area is fairly heavy forest so the project will not be seen. He stated although the proposed overlay is 138 acres they are limited by their agreement with Mr. Maki as well as the capacity of the existing electrical infrastructure to the system size that is shown. Projects typically generate approximately \$13,000-16,000 per MW in tax revenue annually. This system is expected to generate about \$70-75,000 per year, as opposed to less than \$1,000 that is currently collected annually. Roll back taxes of about \$40,000 will also be received in year one. The lease period is proposed to be 25 acres with two 5 year extensions. There will be no cost to the Town. He concluded that only so many of these systems can be installed in any town due to the existing infrastructure, both lines and substations.

J. Hager noted the conceptual layout is not a guarantee. What is being voted is adding the land to the Overlay. If the land is added to the Overlay the project will go through the permitting process which is when the firm plan will be presented. Mr. Maki noted this site has been surveyed so they know this is fairly firm.

Jim Stevenson 212 Putnam Hill Road asked why they are proposing 138 acre instead of the area of the proposed system. Mr. Schulty said it was just a time constraint. They did not have time to survey a smaller area before the petition was due. Mr. Stevenson said if the intention is that this will be the maximum coverage the overlay should be sized accordingly.

T. Beauvais asked how much deforestation will result and if any of the land is productive agricultural land? Mr. Maki stated most of the area has been cleared for the Christmas tree growing. He stated he will not be doing this business for many more years. Mr. Schulty said they do not clear cut, but may top growth that becomes too high. They want to encourage resumed growth once the use goes away.

W. Marquis asked if more projects could be built here? Another installation could be built on a parcel or area within and overlay, but if an installation was proposed on another parcel it would have to be added to the Overlay via Town Meeting vote before it could apply for a permit. To expand from 30 to 60 acres on this same site only Site Plan Review would be required. Mr. Schulty said that under the current State programs they could not do another project on this land.

Clara Kim 9 Stone Circle was concerned no engineering work has been done so the Town is being asked to act without actual data about potential impact. Mr. Schulty noted doing detailed investigation would not be prudent business without the land first being added to the overlay as this would be very expensive. However, they have extensive experience with this type of construction, have past engineering info, and have done some in house engineer on this site so they are not completely blind.

S. Paul noted Overlays are causing angst as they are not like static zoning and this is a new zoning mechanism.

Norm Wenglin 6 Dodge Lane stated establishing an entire property as an overlay appears to eliminate underlying zoning. He expressed with the whole parcel in the Overlay district, once detailed engineering is done the installation could shift anywhere within the 138 acres. S. Paul said the only way to limit that is to have the petitioner reduce the proposed overlay area which can be done with an amended motion to Town Meeting. Mr. Wenglin said he would be supportive of a smaller area.

Tim Hare of 12 Burdon Street asked if there is an upper limitation on the size of systems? There is not currently a bylaw limitation. Mr. Schulty said the State program is currently limited to 5 MW.

J. Stevenson felt the Town should have a clear understanding of the potential maximum buildout. Mr. Schulty said is unlikely anything else will be built in this area as the cost to increase the MW in this area would be so expensive as to not make any economic sense.

John Whittier 150 Town Farm Road stated you likely wouldn't want to expand a system more than 5 MW as you would want to preserve the land buffering the project.

T. Hare asked if the electromagnetic field is the same as high tension lines? No the EMF from solar is not at all the same it is low voltage.

Brian Stevenson 664 Putnam Hill Road asked if the inverters will be up near the panels? Yes, otherwise there is power loss and larger/more expensive wiring would be necessary.

G. Black asked about the typical construction period. Mr. Schulty said it would be about 4 months.

R. Largess said he would be supportive of including smaller parcel. The petitioner was open to a smaller area. J. Hager outlined the process for an amended motion.

S. Paul expressed his concerns about solar although he felt he could support this particular project.

In response to a question from Miriam Sanderson J. Hager explained the meaning of the Board recommending an article is that in the Board's opinion, which is shaped by a member's experience, subject knowledge, and the input received, that the particular article is a good thing for the Town.

J. Anderson expressed misgivings with overlay districts in general. He noted the Board and town residents had previously restricted installations over 250kW to non-residential areas and he still feels systems over this size should only be located in business or industrial areas.

Motion: To recommend that Town Meeting approve this article limiting the acreage to only the area required to support a 5 MW system, R. Largess  
 2<sup>nd</sup>: M. Sanderson  
 Vote: 4-1-0, J. Anderson opposed for the above stated reasons

Article 23 – Wayne Whittier of Whittier Farms Inc. was present to ask for the Board's support to add approximately 88 acres at 226 Putman Hill and 44 Old Mill Road to the Solar Photovoltaic Overlay District for a 4 MW system. He reviewed the history and operations of the farm noting the family is on their fifth generation. Farming is not getting easier, to continue farming they have to make sure all holdings are productive and consider all options to support their farming operations. He stated they did not go looking for this option but were approached many times and when approached by ProTech, a very professional contractor, they agreed to work with them. The intent is to allow them to gain value from land not currently used for farming, and the end of the lease period they will have land cleared and prepared for more agriculture without having to expend any capital. He stressed solar will not become their main crop like the big solar farm in Uxbridge. Lease proceeds for the short term will help support retaining their agricultural operations. He added they don't want to impact their neighbors and have asked ProTech to adjust the project design accordingly.

B. Schulty noted this is a 4 MW system. It consists of several smaller panel fields as opposed to one big mass and design changes requested by the Whittiers resulted in 400-1000' of setback of the installation from abutting lot lines.

W. Marquis wondered about the view from Manchaug Pond as there is a significant difference in elevation between the Lake and the installation that would dramatically change the look and feel of Town and would be too intrusive.

N. Wenglin expressed concerns with setbacks, screening and run off. B. Schulty explained they greatly exceed the required setbacks. He added under stormwater management act they cannot make drainage worse, they must study and maintain existing patterns and volumes and develop a mitigation plan that will have to be approved by the Town boards. Mr. Wenglin felt the use is industrial in nature.

B. Stevenson again stressed that requesting a larger overlay area than is needed for the installation is undesirable. He added this is a beneficial development type versus more homes. He also noted his sister is the closest resident to this installation. He again stressed they are just trying to take advantage of an opportunity that will help the farm survive.

Katie Kinser of 153 Manchaug Road noted she lives close by at the low spot, practically in a swamp and there is no way this project will not make this worse. She added that existing wildlife corridors will be effected. She added she also doesn't like being asked to make a decision without fully understanding the impacts. Mr. Schulty stressed that's why engineers are involved to make sure drainage issues don't happen and manage storm water.

C. Kim asked the Planning Board to consider if there is a geographic or structural reason why this particular lot has characteristics different from surrounding lots that make it more similar to a commercial lot rather than residential, if not why allow an exception for this lot? She expressed concerns with allowing this site to be added to the district stating if the Town allows this parcel to be added what is to stop all similar parcels also being added? She stressed there must be a distinguishing characteristic to justify this amendment. This project will clear 20 acres of woodland or approximately 1,300 full sized trees and 4,000 saplings. It will destroy habitat, create ground water and wetland changes and be a major change in scenery. She stated the owner's financial situation should not be taken into consideration when considering whether or not to allow a change like this. She noted when she put in her adjacent roadway her financial ability to comply with regulations was not considered as was appropriate. She noted her shared 1,500' of lot line would expose her to over 1,300' of panels and other abutters would have even more exposure.

J. Whitter, who has an agricultural degree, stated it is a scientific fact that grass soaks up water better than forest cover.

Linda Nelson of 114 Manchaug Road, owner of Old Holbrook Campground, is concerned about runoff and erosion. She maintained that clearing land for more farmland will not protect the streams and Lake like a forest, it will increase weeds and algae blooms.

Jennifer Stevenson of 212 Putnam Hill Road said there should be independent studies before overlays are placed on the land to make things more restrictive. She asked how many more systems will be coming?!

W. Whittier acknowledged technology will continue to change but will result in being able to get more in less space making more systems less likely. He stressed as a commercial farm they have strict nutrient management requirements and practices. They know exactly what goes on their land and comes off. In fact per acre farms apply only 30% of what a typical homeowners puts on their lawns. Additionally, it is leaves from trees that produce a preponderance of phosphorous, which is a primary component of algae bloom.

It was noted the land will not be sold, it will be leased but it will be removed from c. 61 protection so roll back taxes for the last five years on this acreage will have to be paid to the Town.

Jeff Blakeslee of 122.5 Manchaug Road said this is not the right place for what is essentially a power plant It will negatively affect the watershed and scenery.

J. Whittier noted this land could be 25 homes instead. He noted how much less solar will disturb the area and that it will not result in more children in the schools or more roadways to plow, etc. C. Kim verified in this case the Town would have the first right to purchase the land.

N. Wenglin said this isn't an organized way to zone and designate uses anywhere and it should be done differently. J. Hager explained again that an overlay district is a tool in the Massachusetts zoning toolbox. The Planning Board did not create this overlay, it was petitioned. The Board uses overlay districts for specific planning purposes like the Village Center Overlay District in Sutton Center which allows uses that are not normally allowed within the underlying district but which maybe appropriate if they meet the purpose of the district and comply with regulations like architectural and size that are usually set up for the specific overlay.



She added you also can't prohibit overlay districts in general. Sutton also can't put a moratorium in place because the Town studied solar and put regulations in place years ago. She explained there is typically a purpose section and all that is reviewed by the Attorney General's office. You can't un-ring the overlay bell, the power rests in denying or approving each parcel based on its appropriateness for the overlay.

W. Whittier asked if any issues like those that were found on the proposed Purgatory Road site were discovered could they petition to have the land removed from the Overlay? J. Hager said yes the land could be removed and it was likely she will request the Board petition Town Meeting to remove the Purgatory land from the overlay in the Fall. W. Whittier stated he would likely petition removal of this land if it is added and such issues arise.

In response to a question about whether there are clear cutting restriction in Sutton. J. Hager stated there are no such restrictions, except within a wetland resource area. W. Whittier again stressed they need to maximize their underutilized land to keep the farm viable.

Justin Nyquist of 9 Stone Circle noted he and Clara live on the land right next to this proposal. The land is not flat and has ledge. They had to blast for their road installation. He noted it can't be economical if this has to be done. B. Schulty stated they are able to work with the land anchoring the panel racking system on the existing terrain, not flattening it for installation.

B. Stevenson said he appreciates and believes the Whittier's dedication to their farm, but this has to be restricted from the field if it goes through.

N. Wenglin said the acreage and placement should be reduced and defined. He feels the project will diminish his property value. He stressed he is not against solar but this size proposal is not suitable in this location.

Joe Lane of 222 Putnam Hill Road stated he has doubts about the likelihood of this project noting this is a tough property.

C. Kim stated she did not buy land to be next to a commercial installation. The land that's not being used isn't costing Whittier's money its only assessed at \$9,800. W. Whittier stated they are not getting rich off this proposal. They have intentionally set the proposal back from Ms. Kim even though they could make more money coming closer. The proposal will benefit the Town as a whole. He noted just their small system at the farm has saved the equivalent of burning 200,000 lbs of coal and 700 trees.

M. Sanderson felt the Town should carefully weigh the pros and cons and give the project a shot.

S. Paul said again although he does like large solar he would be supportive of the project in a smaller size overlay. He expressed great concerns with this type of State mandate.

W. Baker noted the 2012 Master Plan highlighted the rural ambiance of the Town and therefore he has reservations with a large installation in the middle of the Town. He agreed the Whittier's have been stalwart members of the community. He would go with a reduced area, but is concerned about visual and resource impacts.

R. Largess stated perhaps the bylaws should be revisited before more proposals like these come forward.

J. Anderson noted he has his own small ground mounted system and is highly supportive of solar and the Whittiers, but a system of this size has its place in the industrial districts and this isn't a good way to conduct zoning after so much effort had been put into the original regulation of solar.

Motion: To recommend the Town Meeting approve this article with the area reduced to support only a 4 MW system positioned as shown on the plan, S. Paul  
2<sup>nd</sup>: R. Largess  
Vote: 4-1-0, J. Anderson opposed for the above stated reasons.

Article 24 – Jack Tannar Jr. of 7B Merrill Road was present to request the Board's support of adding 13 acres to the solar overlay at 16 Carr Street.

Anthony Joseph of OmniNavitas was present to review the proposed installation. They are proposing a 4-5 acre installation of just under 1 MW. He stated they do not propose taking down any trees and are proposing setbacks to the project two to three times those required by the regulations. He also showed the existing mature screening to remain but also showed the Board their proposed 3 tiers of screening plantings and noted they are open to additional requests and requirements the Board feels are appropriate. He noted their company would rather not have the system visible. He noted this proposal is far less invasive than homes and certainly quieter.

In response to a question from B. Stevenson Mr. Joseph stated their average lease is about \$22,000 per MW. Mr. Stevenson expressed the same concern with more property being proposed than what is supposedly being used.

Gabriel Geiss 14 Carr Street stated they bought their house here because they like the country. They've invested a lot of work in the house and feel the value will be diminished by this installation.

Joan Geiss of 14 Carr Street noted the house is on a knoll so it looks down to the field. She showed the Board pictures. She stated she's not against solar but doesn't want to see her property value reduced by seeing panels from every room in her house.

Mr. John Geiss of 14 Carr Street said this house was the town eyesore and now increases the value of properties around it.

T. Hare asked if this was a previous retreat lot? J. Hager stated yes it was but that permit has expired, but the applicant will still have to prove the lot is buildable. He noted at least this wasn't more proposed homes or a low income project. He was also concerned about the safety of children in the area. The system will be fenced. The fence could be made non-climbable if necessary. It will take about 2-3 months to construct.

Deb Carkin of 22 Carr Street asked how long the company has been in business. Mr. Glen Frank stated the company has been in business for 4 years and was awarded a contract by the MBTA of 37 stations, but has not done any projects like this.

Bill Carkin of 22 Carr Street asked about future changes. Mr. John McDonough said it is uneconomical to make changes after the whole system has been built. The interconnection agreement is based on the original design and the project won't change once that is approved.

Joan Geiss said the current screening on the east is deciduous, there should be more sensitivity to abutters.

Mr. Joseph reiterated they intend to build this system in accordance with requirements and to everyone's satisfaction. The company is happy to do a site walk and come up with mitigation that meets abutters needs.

Deb Carkin asked what happens to the property after the system comes down. The owner would have to come back to the Planning Board and/or Town only for uses allowed in accordance with the bylaws.

In response to a question J. Hager explained zoning articles must achieve a 2/3<sup>rd</sup> vote of those present and voting.

Mrs. Weiss noted the bylaw says installations should only be allowed where they can be installed "without adverse impact" she asked what this means to the Board members? S. Paul said the Board considers visual impact, safety, noise, lighting and other elements required by the regulations.

Motion: To recommend the Town Meeting approve this article with the area reduced to support only a 1 MW system, R. Largess  
2<sup>nd</sup>: S. Paul  
Vote: 4-1-0, J. Anderson opposed as he feels anything over 250 kw should be only in commercial or industrial areas

Article 20 is a housekeeping article to show within the Use Table that large ground mounted solar systems are also permitted within the Solar Photovoltaic Overlay District (SPOD). If the article does not pass the use will still otherwise be permitted as it exists in other provisions of the bylaw, this just produces more transparency.

Motion: To recommend the Town Meeting approve this, R. Largess  
2<sup>nd</sup>: S. Paul  
Vote: 5-0-0

Article 21 was requested by Assessor Robert Nunnemacher to prohibit structures from straddling the Town Line causing valuation and assessment issues.

Motion: To recommend that Town Meeting approve this article, R. Largess  
2<sup>nd</sup>: W. Baker  
Vote: 5-0-0

Motion: To close the public hearing, W. Baker  
2<sup>nd</sup>: S. Paul  
Vote: 5-0-0

Motion: To Adjourn, W. Baker  
2<sup>nd</sup>: S. Paul  
Vote: 5-0-0

Adjourned 10:55 PM