



TOWN OF NORTHBOROUGH PLANNING BOARD

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

Approved 9.17.19

Planning Board Meeting Minutes August 6, 2019

Members in attendance: Kerri Martinek, Chair; Amy Poretsky, Vice Chair; Millie Milton

Members excused: Anthony Ziton; Michelle Gillespie

Others in attendance: Kathy Joubert, Town Planner; Jason Perreault, 27 Treetop Circle; Ronald Doucett, 29 St. James Drive; Henry Squillante, 72 Crestwood Drive; Ed Bombard, 28 Crawford Street; Julianne Hirsh, 19 Smith Road; Lisa Maselli, 13 Maple Street

Chair Kerri Martinek called the meeting to order at 7:05pm.

Ms. Martinek welcomed audience members and explained that the board will be accepting public comments following their discussion of the Master Plan Goals and Recommendations.

Consideration of the Minutes of the Meeting of July 16, 2019 was deferred to the next meeting.

Discussion re: June 17, 2019 joint meeting minutes – Ms. Martinek noted that the board wanted to more thoroughly review and discuss the Minutes of the Joint Meeting with the Board of Selectmen because members had proposed some amendments to them. Ms. Poretsky mentioned that the draft minutes contain a statement about Brad Blanchette attributed to the Planning Board that was not said. She requested that the statement be changed and emphasized her desire for the minutes to be accurate.

Ms. Poretsky quoted specifics of the deliberation discussion about Mr. Blanchette, and voiced concerns about the following statement:

“Board members stressed the need for better communication between the Planning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) and are concerned that Mr. Blanchette wouldn’t be the best choice in this regard.”

Ms. Poretsky acknowledged that, while the board does have a desire to have open communication with the ZBA, this statement about Mr. Blanchette was not made during the joint meeting. She stated her belief that the board has a good relationship with Mr. Blanchette and the statement conveys otherwise. She would like the statement to be struck from the minutes and would like the Board of Selectmen to do the same. She indicated that she did not see anything else of real concern.

Ms. Martinek noted tonight’s absence of Mr. Ziton and Ms. Gillespie. She stated that she had listened to the recording of the joint meeting and noted that there were some comments in the minutes that were

attributed to the wrong parties and portions of the discussion were summarized that appear to include mischaracterizations of what was actually deliberated at the time. She also mentioned that, when the Planning Board initially looked at the minutes and indicated a desire to make some edits, they had already been approved by the Board of Selectmen. She voiced her opinion that the inaccuracies noted are in the portion of the meeting involving the Planning Board and she does not believe that the Board of Selectmen knowingly approved inaccurate minutes. She expressed a desire to have minutes that this board believes to be accurate and represent what was actually said, and suggested that the Planning Board develop their own minutes.

Ms. Martinek commented that, in reviewing the recording, she noticed a few things that she would like redone. She also voiced concern about having two sets of minutes for the same meeting, potentially causing confusion for members of the public, but also noted that it is the prerogative of each board to have their own minutes if they so choose. She stated that she would like to have the board secretary draft minutes of the deliberation discussions for each of the candidates since that is the section where it appears there is the most concern about inaccuracies. Ms. Poretsky agreed, especially since those discussions influenced how the board members voted.

Master Plan Steering Committee (MPSC) Update – Ms. Martinek noted that Ms. Gillespie was to have led the discussion and asked Ms. Poretsky to do so in her absence. She also suggested that the discussion focus on

- Highlights
- Any critical debates
- Any impacts on the Planning Board
- Any extremes or “quick hits”
- Determination of short term, immediate term, and long term goals

Review of Goals and Recommendations

Natural, Historical, and Historic Resources

NCH-1: Preserve and enhance the natural landscapes of the community, including farmlands -

Ms. Poretsky indicated that she had few comments since she believes that Norm Corbin had thoroughly reviewed this section and she agrees with most of it. She expressed her opinion that the town does a lot in this regard through conservation restrictions, reaching out to farms, and other initiatives driven by the Open Space Committee.

Ms. Poretsky also voiced her understanding that work on removal of dams is already underway.

Ms. Joubert informed the board that the version of the Goals and Recommendations document (copy attached) that was provided tonight includes Mr. Ziton’s questions and comments.

NCH-2: Maintain and expand the protection of Northborough’s historic resources including buildings, structures, landscapes, and documents

– Ms. Poretsky noted that the town has a small zone, Main Street Residential, that includes the area between the library and Stone’s Cycles, where there are many older homes. She noted that several of the homes have been converted to two and three family homes over the years, and emphasized that it was done through interior renovations and not tear-downs. She expressed her desire to see more efforts to preserve the historical homes in this area. In response to a question from Ms. Martinek

about any Design Review guidelines for the historical area, Ms. Joubert explained there are no guidelines for residential properties. She also noted that the town currently has designated historic districts around the Unitarian Church and on a single home on Whitney Street. She explained that property owners within these districts are required to go before the Historic District Commission if they wish to do any work on the exterior of the building.

Ms. Poretsky discussed the need to explore ways to incentivize restoration of historic buildings, and voiced her opinion that Design Review would be integral to that effort. Ms. Joubert suggested that this effort would probably have more to do with tax incentives and other funding means that the Historic District Commission could educate the public about. She indicated that this would not be anything that would involve the Planning Board or ZBA.

NCH-3 : Repurpose surplus Town-owned buildings and facilities for community needs – Ms. Poretsky noted that there is already a committee formed to address uses for the White Cliffs property. She also mentioned the Boundary Street property that is continually being discussed. She suggested that the town should start work on a feasibility study for the Old Town Hall building at 4 West Main Street, since that building comes back to the town in 2022 if the town opts to repurchase it.

NHC4: Coordinate efforts among cultural, historical, and environmental organizations – Ms. Poretsky discussed the recommendation to investigate opportunities to hire interns (NCH4-4) and voiced her support of the idea as it provides an economical way to get help.

Ms. Martinek asked if the town currently has a Historic Preservation Plan. Ms. Joubert noted that, though there is no formal plan, the Historic District Commission has done several studies to support their cause. She indicated that there is interest in doing an in-depth plan.

In response to a question from Ms. Martinek about ways in which the Planning Board might support these efforts, Ms. Joubert confirmed that the board will be involved with the majority of these goals and recommendations.

Ms. Poretsky explained that the draft of the entire Master Plan document is expected to be provided on August 20th and comments will be due within 10 days, which she hopes will afford enough time for a thorough review given the length of the document.

Ms. Joubert noted that the MPSC will be meeting at the library on September 12th to finalize the document as well reviewing the draft implementation plan to identify which department will lead each effort and who else will be involved.

Economic Development

ED1-1: Define downtown in terms of its geography (e.g., Downtown Business District), appearance, branding, and function

ED1-1: Create a Downtown planning/revitalization committee made up of Downtown business owners, representatives from Town boards, and other stakeholders that will recommend the boundaries of Downtown, support the Town's Planning office, assist in proposing and overseeing plans to enhance the Downtown, and pursue Community

Preservation Act funding and other funding sources to enable this enhancement – Ms. Poretsky suggested that this effort should start right away.

Ms. Poretsky also discussed recommendation **ED1-3, Explore options for creating a fresh and cohesive identity or brand for the new Downtown area such as unified signage and facades, including wayfinding and marketing materials. Use signage to clarify the boundaries of the new downtown**, and noted that there are grants that become available in October that the town should avail itself of. Ms. Martinek discussed the importance of maintenance if the town is going to put any effort into brand creation.

ED1-2: Explore potential acquisitions or land deals to appropriately scale the Downtown - Ms. Poretsky voiced support for this goal and noted that the downtown area has a lot of very small lots that do not provide sufficient area for development. She noted that it would be up to the Board of Selectmen and Town Administrator to approve the purchase of small lots in the downtown area.

ED1-4: Conduct a parking study to assess and address parking activity and pedestrian issues in Downtown, and to plan for future needs – Ms. Poretsky noted that this is another critical goal.

ED1-5: Explore the potential for repurposing 4 West Main Street (the old Town Hall) as an anchor for the Downtown. Conduct a feasibility study to identify options and recommendations – Ms. Poretsky suggested that this should be a critical short-term goal.

ED1-6 : Undertake a study to explore the potential of designating Downtown as a Business Improvement District, which would create a special assessment district where property owners would agree to organize and finance services above and beyond those already provided by the Town - Ms. Poretsky stated that she was initially opposed to this recommendation, since the town already has a hard time attracting businesses to downtown. She expressed concern that taxing businesses even further would be a deterrent. However, she noted that businesses in Worcester where such a district exists actually like the program. Ms. Milton voiced her opinion that this would work much like a condo fee where everyone benefits, but suggested that the business owners should be consulted. She also voiced her opinion that this initiative may help to improve some of the properties that are not as well maintained. Ms. Poretsky noted that MPSC member, Justin Dufresne, works in Worcester and fully supports this recommendation but she is still unsure. Ms. Milton suggested that it might work if implemented on a voluntary basis where those that contribute will receive the benefit. She voiced her opinion that it would likely not be successful if it was mandated.

Ms. Poretsky stated that a business like CVS would have the funds to contribute but smaller businesses may not be financially able to do so. Ms. Joubert explained that this is a very successful state-sponsored program and there are a number of communities where establishment of a Business Improvement District has been effective. She noted that the process is very involved and does require buy-in to be successful. She

mentioned that it has been offered as a possibility as the town looks to improve the economic vitality of the community and could be one of the tools to do so.

Ms. Poretsky mentioned that a grant would do some of the same things, but indicated that she does not know much about it. In response to a request from Ms. Joubert to clarify, Ms. Poretsky voiced her understanding that the grant provides funding for downtown improvements. Ms. Joubert noted that there are a variety of grants available from the state, with the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) having a very robust downtown initiative. Ms. Poretsky asked if the state notifies communities when certain grants will be available, and noted that the town sometimes seems to miss out on these opportunities. Ms. Joubert confirmed that the Town Administrator and Planning Department are automatically notified by the State when grants become available and agreed to provide board members with the information when received.

Ms. Martinek stated that Mr. Ziton wanted clarification about whether this is a tax on businesses. She also noted that he had questioned how the town can incentivize business owners to locate their businesses here and cautioned against making it burdensome to do so.

ED1-7: Look for opportunities to incorporate other public gathering places, such as the Town Common and Library, into the Downtown framework. Advance efforts to connect gathering places and businesses for improved walkability and accessibility –

Ms. Poretsky voiced uncertainty about any additional gathering places in the downtown area, and voiced uncertainty about what this action item would entail other than improving sidewalks.

ED2: Promote (re)development opportunities for vacant or underutilized commercial and industrial properties - Ms. Poretsky noted that this recommendation was a high priority expressed in the surveys submitted as part of the Master Plan process.

ED2-1: Evaluate the need for, and ability to sustain, a dedicated economic development staff to actively engage the Town's business community, promote the Town's economic attractiveness, and coordinate the Town's economic development efforts -

Ms. Poretsky noted that this was discussed by the MPSC and, though it is unclear if economic development staff is in the budget, she feels strongly that an economic development committee should be established in the very least. She mentioned that websites for other communities provide information in an effort to encourage business and expressed a desire for Northborough to do so.

ED2-2: Consider engaging a real estate advisory firm to create a redevelopment strategy for the Town's business districts. The strategy should incorporate analysis of appropriate uses, scale/dimension/design, as well as the infrastructure and services needed to support these redevelopments –

Ms. Poretsky mentioned that the recommendation has changed since first proposed, but there was discussion about industrial uses in the Business West district, whether they are appropriate uses, and how to get the districts to be commercial. She questioned if there is an appropriate strategy to make it work and whether a Real Estate advisory firm is needed to do so.

Ms. Joubert stated that the recommendation has already been adopted by the MPSC. She explained that there are firms that provide a variety of services to both the private and public sectors, including evaluating financial impacts of development and zoning.

Ms. Martinek noted that Mr. Ziton suggested that it would be more efficient and productive to use state resources and model our approach after other towns that have successfully redeveloped their downtowns. Ms. Joubert stated that there are differing factors that affect what is a successful downtown, and they vary for every community. She confirmed that the town always looks for available state resources to utilize.

Ms. Poretsky discussed the magnitude of visitors to Tougas Farm and expressed a desire to find a way to encourage them to stay longer. She noted that Meredith, NH invites people to “Stay, Eat, and Play” and suggested that the town include some information on our website about other opportunities in and around town.

Ms. Martinek suggested that the board focus on those items in the document for which members have input to offer.

ED2-4: Engage more proactively with land owners in the Town’s industrial districts, taking advantage of the aggregation of the property interests and working collaboratively to both market and develop industrial-zoned sites – Ms. Poretsky asked if the Planning Board could obtain a list of such sites that are left in town for development.

ED2-5: Explore the idea of fiscal impact assessments or mitigation funding from new developments that account for the development’s added traffic, utility loads, etc. and utilize these funds for upgrades that are required to support the development or that benefit the community – Ms. Poretsky noted that mitigation has been discussed rather extensively and asked Ms. Joubert if something has to be added to the bylaw in order to require mitigation from developers. Ms. Joubert noted this would depend on what type of mitigation is proposed. She suggested that, if the town wants to pursue development impact fees, it would end up being a zoning bylaw but would require involvement from the Board of Selectmen and Financial Planning Committee. She indicated that impact fees are a positive for the community as a whole but business sometimes views them as a deterrent. She suggested that, if done properly and fairly, it might make sense for the community to look at it. Ms. Poretsky noted that Mr. Dufresne had expressed surprise that Northborough does not already have such mitigation funding mechanisms in place.

Ms. Poretsky expressed concern about deterring business. In response to a question from Ms. Milton about whether there is a designation for how these impact fees are used, Ms. Joubert explained that it is all part of the formula. She noted that the impact fee bylaw would provide for the percentage of the fee to be distributed among town departments depending on impacts.

ED-3: Grow and connect the local business community and position it to be resilient in the face of changing economic conditions – Members of the board offered no questions or comments.

ED-4: Position the Town to attract more visitors and commercial tax revenue

ED4-1: Explore the possibility of attracting hospitality uses to the Route 9 commercial node through market analysis and discussions with local operators - Ms. Poretsky questioned the need for a market analysis. Ms. Joubert stated that a market analysis would assist the town in determining what will work. Ms. Poretsky noted that the Apex Center in Marlborough gets a tremendous amount of business from visitors to the baseball training facility in Northborough and she suggested that a hotel or Friendly's near the facility would be beneficial to Northborough, as they could stay and eat here. She wasn't sure a market analysis was needed as we can see what is working in the other towns.

ED4-3: For publicly controlled sites such as the Westborough State Hospital in Northborough and the Boundary Street property, develop a master plan to address key needs to include economic development, housing, recreation, and other possibilities as appropriate – Ms. Martinek explained that there had been some discussion about whether to be so specific in the plan. Ms. Poretsky recalled the conversation but noted that the Westborough State Hospital property was deemed important enough to have a detailed action item to address it.

Ms. Joubert indicated that there has been ongoing conversation within town staff about the Boundary Street property, and the town will evaluate whether it is needed for additional sewer capacity once the litigation over the Marlborough treatment plant has been resolved. If not, other uses will be proposed for consideration. She also noted that the situation is the same with the Westborough State Hospital property as it is still unknown as to how much of the property located in Northborough will be disposed of and, once that is decided, the town can analyze options for what to do with it if were we to seek to acquire it.

Ms. Martinek noted that the next meeting of the MPSC is scheduled for September 12th.

Board Meeting Schedule – Ms. Joubert noted that the board typically resumes their schedule of two meetings per month (first and third Tuesdays) once the summer is over. She mentioned that, per that schedule, the September meetings would be held on September 3rd and 17th and asked if September 3rd would be problematic. After some discussion, members of the board agreed to meet on September 5th and 17th, assuming Ms. Gillespie and Mr. Ziton are available.

Ms. Joubert stated that she has tentatively scheduled a member from the CMRPC to appear at the September 17th meeting to discuss details of a Solar Bylaw and potentially a Hazardous Waste Facility Bylaw.

Master Plan - Ms. Martinek noted that many valuable comments about the Master Plan were received from the audience at the board's last meeting and she asked if anyone in the audience has anything further to offer.

Lisa Maselli, 13 Maple Street, voiced her opinion that the Historical Preservation Program should apply to the White Cliffs property but it should not be targeted for potential re-use as municipal offices or similar. She recalled that Article 42 that was approved at the 2016 Town Meeting specified that the

property was to be purchased for historic preservation purposes. She emphasized that the land with the building could be utilized for a number of different uses and suggested that the town should be able to do something with the building that will bring in people other than using it for town offices, condominiums, etc. She reiterated that the White Cliffs should be removed from the plan for potential re-use and put into the historic preservation category. She suggested that, if the intent is for it to be targeted for potential re-use or municipal use, the matter should go back to Town Meeting for approval of the change.

Ms. Maselli also raised the issue of sidewalks, tree replanting and traffic concerns and asked where those matters will be addressed. Ms. Poretsky voiced her opinion that they will be covered under Land Use. Ms. Maselli voiced frustration with sidewalks and safety, as well as the traffic situation that appears to be getting worse. She emphasized a need for something to be done to protect pedestrians. She also mentioned the importance of having contiguous sidewalks and cited the poor conditions in front of the Hillside Grille. Ms. Poretsky noted that the transportation section in the Master Plan addresses traffic calming measures.

Ms. Maselli mentioned that many trees are being removed during the course of development, and she is not sure that the replanting of trees is actually being done. Ms. Poretsky noted that the matter is covered in section LU-2-5 in the Master Plan recommendations, and noted the importance for the board to consider the issue when the board is addressing applications.

Henry Squillante, 72 Crestwood Drive, recalled that the discussion about the White Cliffs at Town Meeting included the potential that it could be sold if the town could not determine what to do with the property. Ms. Joubert also noted that the discussion included preservation as well as evaluating how to re-use the building, with various options being proposed. She indicated that, regardless of what the property is eventually used for or who owns it, there will be a historical preservation restriction on it.

Julianne Hirsh, 19 Smith Road, asked if there was any attention given to eco-friendly buildings, clean energy use, or similar efforts. Ms. Poretsky noted that, under the Green Communities initiative, there are practices that will come into play. In response to a question from Ms. Martinek about any particular programs of interest, Ms. Hirsh noted that some communities are installing car chargers and solar. Ms. Poretsky recalled that car charging stations have been discussed.

Ms. Joubert explained that the board will be working on a large scale solar bylaw for Town Meeting at one of their meetings next month. Ms. Martinek discussed the importance for the Master Plan to stand the test of time. Ms. Poretsky mentioned that the Planning Board does have the ability to make amendments and updates to the Master Plan as the need arises without having to do an entirely new one. Mr. Squillante noted that car charging stations are mentioned in section T-4-2.

Ms. Martinek stated that the board will discuss land use and housing at their meeting on September 5, 2019.

Ms. Joubert reiterated that the next meeting of the MPSC will be on Sept. 12th at the library, and noted that there may or may not be a subsequent meeting scheduled. She indicated that the final meeting will be held on Monday, October 21st, when the MPSC and consultants will make a presentation to the Planning Board and Board of Selectmen. Ms. Poretsky suggested that the joint meeting should be held by the Planning Board since the Master Plan is under its purview. She recalled issues with the Minutes from the recent joint meeting with the Board of Selectmen and expressed a desire to avoid a

recurrence. After some discussion, Ms. Martinek suggested that the Planning Board could hold a separate meeting after the joint presentation at which they would vote to adopt the Master Plan. Ms. Joubert noted that, if following the board's typical schedule, the October meetings would fall on October 1st and 15th, but the board could opt to alter the schedule if they so choose. Ms. Martinek expressed a desire to review the board presentation, the joint presentation component, and the Planning Board's public hearing and adoption when the entire board is present. Members of the board agreed.

Bonds – Ms. Joubert provided the board with a quick update on the Newton Street bond. She explained that the DPW Director and Town Engineer had met with the developer and his contractor at the site earlier today, and the developer has indicated a willingness to do the work. She noted that the town had emphasized a desire for the work to be done before school starts, and the contractor believes he will be able to do so.

Ms. Joubert stated that, at this point, no further action is needed by the board and she expects to have something more definitive for the board's next meeting. Ms. Martinek noted that the board had previously received concerns from Newton Street residents and asked if any additional comments have been provided. Ms. Joubert noted that there have been none.

Subcommittee Updates

Open Space Committee – Ms. Poretsky noted that the Open Space Committee is beginning the process of drafting their Open Space Plan using a lot of the data from the Master Plan and CMRPC. She explained that the committee is required to do so every 7 years, and a formal plan is required in order to qualify for grants. Ms. Joubert indicated that the kickoff meeting for the Open Space Plan will be held on September 30th and members will be receiving notification via email in the next week or so.

Members indicated that there have been no recent meetings of the **Community Preservation Committee (CPC)**, **Design Review Committee (DRC)**, or **Groundwater Advisory Committee (GAC)**, so there are no updates to report.

Central Massachusetts Regional Planning Commission (CMRPC) – Ms. Martinek noted that, at the last meeting she attended, there was discussion about developing a regional housing plan. She also discussed a variety of websites that offer a multitude of data and information about the topic.

Ms. Martinek explained that, through the CMRPC, the town receives local planning assistance hours and has the ability to earn additional hours through attending CMRPC events. She noted that both she and Ms. Hirsh attended all of the CMRPC meetings last year and were able to accumulate several extra hours. In response to a question from Ms. Martinek about how these hours are typically delegated, Ms. Joubert noted that some hours this year will be allocated to the development of the Open Space Plan. She mentioned that, in the past, hours were used for work on the Right to Farm bylaw, and this year the town will likely be able to get help with the Solar Bylaw and perhaps the Hazardous Waste Facility Bylaw. Ms. Martinek voiced her opinion that delegation of these hours should come through the Planning Board and suggested that members of the board come up with ideas of how we want to use them. Ms. Joubert agreed to provide the board with information about what has already been allocated for the Open Space Plan.

Prep for 2020 Town Meeting

Solar Bylaw – Ms. Joubert mentioned that, since the board’s last meeting, she has been in touch with Kelly Brown, Regional Coordinator, Green Communities Division, Central Region, Massachusetts Department of Energy Resources about any additional information other than what has already been provided and she has indicated that she does not have anything additional. Ms. Joubert also noted that the CMRPC has staff that is well versed in solar bylaws and she has already contacted them about assisting with our bylaw development. She mentioned that they are willing to come to an upcoming meeting to give us an overview of where the solar industry and solar bylaws are, and she has tentatively scheduled them to do so on September 17th.

Ms. Joubert indicated that she has also asked the CMRPC for assistance with the Hazardous Waste Facilities Bylaw, but this is something very new for them. She explained that the CMRPC will reach out to an engineering firm that they work with to try to get some insight. She mentioned that there are not many communities in MA that have this type of bylaw so there are not a lot of examples. In addition, she and the CMRPC will need to contact the DEP to do some basic research before they can advise the board.

Draft Board Appointment Policy – Ms. Joubert explained that she had provided board members with both the original version she had prepared, which was a modification of the Board of Selectmen’s policy, and one that Ms. Martinek had reviewed and commented on last year.

Ms. Martinek mentioned that she was informed by a resident that they were unable to find information about how to apply for the opening on the DRC. Ms. Joubert explained that the vacancy is supposed to be posted on the town website and agreed to check into it.

Ms. Martinek noted that the draft policy did not cover rotation of members and asked members if they had any input about how to do that. Ms. Joubert noted that Town Counsel suggested that the board should start with newly appointed members who would be subject to the new policy. Ms. Martinek emphasized her desire for the rotation to apply to all members, since applying it only to new members defeats the intent of the bylaw that was to provide for evaluation of members every three years.

Ms. Martinek suggested that the board further discuss the matter when Ms. Gillespie is in attendance since she is Chair of the DRC. In the meantime, Ms. Joubert agreed to get clarification from Town Counsel.

Ms. Martinek voiced her opinion that the Board of Selectmen’s policy is good and offered the following comments:

- a 6-month period for keeping something on file is too short and she would prefer that it be 12 months.
- an Interview Subcommittee would not make sense for the Planning Board.
- It is not necessary to defer deliberation to a subsequent meeting.

Ms. Joubert recalled that the board also wanted to address conflict of interest concerns, and it was agreed that language be added to stipulate that a member shall recuse themselves in accordance with the Massachusetts Conflict of Interest laws.

Ms. Joubert noted that she had not received any comments on the document from Mr. Zitton or Ms. Gillespie.

In response to a question from Ms. Martinek about the policy for board/committee attendance, Ms. Joubert explained that a letter is sent to any members who miss three consecutive meetings.

Members of the board agreed to wait until Ms. Gillespie and Mr. Zitton are in attendance to approve the Board Appointment policy.

In response to a question from Ms. Milton about whether there is any formal policy about a minimum number of meetings that a member would be expected to attend, Ms. Joubert indicated there is not.

Town Planner Update – Ms. Joubert indicated that she had nothing further to provide.

Next Meetings for the Planning Board – Ms. Joubert agreed to check with Ms. Gillespie and Mr. Zitton about their availability for the proposed September meeting dates (September 5th and 17th).

Members of the board agreed to discuss meeting dates for October when all members are present.

Ms. Martinek asked Ms. Joubert to poll Mr. Zitton and Ms. Gillespie for their availability to attend the October 21st joint meeting for the MPSC presentation and stressed the importance of all members being present. Ms. Poretsky reiterated her desire for the presentation to be done as part of a Planning Board meeting since the Master Plan is under its purview and asked for Ms. Martinek's thoughts. Ms. Martinek suggested that the board determine whether Mr. Zitton and Ms. Gillespie are available on October 21st since that appears to be when the consultant can attend. Ms. Joubert noted that the board could hold also have a presentation done when they hold their public hearing on the plan. Ms. Poretsky stated that having a presentation done twice does not make sense and suggested holding a joint meeting at the library, called by the Planning Board. She reiterated her concerns, especially given the recent issue with joint meeting minutes and the apparent unwillingness of the Board of Selectmen to work with the Planning Board to modify the content in question. Ms. Martinek asked Ms. Joubert to ask the consultant if they are available on any other dates. She also suggested that the board be prepared to produce its own set of minutes.

Jason Perreault, Chair of the Board of Selectmen, explained that there was never any intent not to cooperate with correcting the minutes. He noted that he had seen Ms. Poretsky's message specifically about statements attributed to the Planning Board and, after reviewing the recording, he agrees with this board and voiced his intent to move ahead to get the minutes corrected at the Board of Selectmen's next meeting. He also stated that, as far as a public hearing for the presentation of the Master Plan, he has no issue if the Planning Board wants to call the joint meeting and take the lead in drafting the minutes for that meeting.

Ms. Poretsky reiterated her desire to hold the meeting at the library if possible. Ms. Martinek agreed that the library is a nicer facility. Ms. Joubert agreed to check the library for availability.

Next ZBA Meeting, August 27th - Ms. Joubert explained there is one application before the ZBA at their next meeting which is for a vacant building at 425 Whitney Street. She noted that the property was recently purchased by Steris, who has operated in town for a number of years, and is proposing to construct an addition on the building that will require a variance for one of the setbacks. In response to a question from Ms. Poretsky, Ms. Joubert noted that the addition is needed to house sterilization equipment that Steris plans to move from their existing facility.

Ms. Poretsky asked about the application for 125 Rice Avenue. Ms. Joubert indicated that an updated application has not yet been submitted, but she expects to have it by August 22nd. Ms. Poretsky asked Ms. Joubert to forward a copy of the application to the board members and Ms. Joubert agreed to do so.

Ms. Martinek asked about a joint meeting with the ZBA that was requested by the Planning Board. Ms. Joubert explained that she was not present for the ZBA's last meeting and it appears the request was not discussed, but she is planning to do so at their next meeting.

Ms. Poretsky asked if the Hazardous Waste Facility Bylaw will be discussed at an upcoming meeting. Ms. Joubert indicated that, if the CMRPC is able to obtain information in time, it will be on the agenda for a September meeting. Ms. Poretsky suggested inviting the Board of Health agent to attend, since he will be involved. Ms. Joubert agreed to extend the invitation.

Meeting adjourned at 9:25PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Elaine Rowe
Board Secretary