



**EDGARTOWN PLANNING BOARD  
NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING / AGENDA**

Tuesday, January 21, 2020 at 5:30 PM  
Edgartown Town Offices, 70 Main Street

Edgartown, Mass  
Town Clerk's Office  
Jan 16, 2020  
Rec'd for Record  
AT 9:50 AM

**SITE VISITS**

**CALL TO ORDER**

**SCHEDULED BUSINESS**

**5:30 PM: PUBLIC HEARING: SP (CONT'D FROM DEC 17, DEC 3, 2019) -- MARTHA'S VINEYARD REFUSE DISTRICT, 750 WEST TISBURY ROAD (25-4)**

Restructuring of Traffic Flow. Clear area to separate residential users from commercial and heavy equipment operations. The project will allow the Refuse District to stay in compliance with MASS D.E.P. regulations of proper handling and sorting of waste ban materials. Don Hatch, Applicant.

**5:55 PM: PUBLIC HEARING: SP (POOL) (CONT'D FROM JANUARY 7, 2019) - 91 WEEKS LANE (12A-17) - KLUCHNIK**

**6:00 PM: PRESENTATION: MV COMMISSION DRI CHECKLIST COMMITTEE**

Presentation and discussion regarding the proposed changes to the DRI Checklist

**OTHER BUSINESS**

**SECOND READING: ZONING BYLAW CHANGES**

**MASTER PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE: APPOINTMENTS**

**ADMINISTRATIVE**

**PAYROLL: JANUARY 21, 2019**

**MINUTES: NOVEMBER 11, 2019, DECEMBER 3, 2019, DECEMBER 17, 2019, JANUARY 7, 2019**

**OTHER BUSINESS NOT REASONABLY ANTICIPATED 48 HOURS IN ADVANCE**

**ADJOURN**

**LINK TO MEETING MATERIALS**  
**<http://bit.ly/EPB-2020-0121>**

# Edgartown Planning Board Minutes

---

Tuesday, January 21, 2020

A regular meeting of the Edgartown Planning Board was scheduled for Tuesday, January 21, 2020, at 5:30 PM at the Edgartown Town Hall, Main Street, Edgartown.

*PRESENT: Fred Mascolo, Michael McCourt, Lucy Morrison, Scott Morgan, Glen Searle, James Cisek (Alternate)*

*ABSENT:*

## **CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 PM, and a quorum was declared.

## **SITE VISITS**

No site visits were scheduled.

## **SCHEDULED BUSINESS**

### **5:30 PM: PUBLIC HEARING: SP (cont'd from Dec 17, Dec 3, 2019) -- Martha's Vineyard Refuse District, 750 West Tisbury Road (25-4)**

Present for the applicant: Mr. Don Hatch (Manager), and Doug Rice, Wright-Pierce Engineering on an application to reconfigure access and traffic at the exiting MVRRD.

The chair continued the public hearing at 5:31 PM.

#### **Presentation**

Mr. Hatch presented an aerial view of the site, with notations as to the locations of the property corners, groundwater testing wells, 100-foot setback lines, and the outlines of the new roads.

The current roadway location was noted in relation to the new roadway location.

The topic of sound was addressed. It was noted that pickup trucks would not be directed along the new southern entrance road, only passenger vehicles.

The location of the berm and the first drainage swale was noted. The height of the berm was noted as 12 feet above current grade; a six-foot concrete block wall would be placed at the top of the berm. Landscaping trees would be placed on the neighbor's (South) side of the berm.

There was some discussion related to the location of the berm, the location of the groundwater test wells, and etc.

There was some discussion about groundwater testing well depths, location requirements, and test results.

The location of the berm was discussed, as was the reasons for the specific length of the berm.

The amount and type of traffic using the facility was discussed, as was the number of vehicles using the scales versus "by the bag" customers. No definitive numbers were discussed, but an estimated 1 in 2 vehicles would likely be using the new southern entrance (paying by the bag).

The volume of use at the site was discussed. Mr. Hatch noted that, based on receipts, the busiest days were Sunday and Tuesday.

There was a brief discussion related to sound energy over distance.

The hours of the facility were discussed.

Mr. Mascolo asked for public commentary:

Ms. Hathaway noted that the Teles lot (Assrs Pcl 25-6.2) currently has a residence on it with a second one located immediately south of it. Ms. Hathaway asked why more than four acres of trees were to be cleared in order to provide for a rerouting of traffic:

Mr. Mascolo: The Planning Board understands that this project is being proposed in order to allow the MVRR&RRD to reach compliance with rules established by the State.

Ms. Hathaway: when this was brought for an application, the reason was to separate residential traffic from commercial waste handling.

Mr. Hatch: It is true that the MVRRD will have to manage waste in a significantly different way. Due to new recycling rules, we're going to have to radically change how we accept, sort, and transport recycling materials.

Ms. Hathaway: With this proposal, a new composting is being considered and planned for. It seems that there are some aspects of the overall plan that aren't even being addressed.

Mr. Hatch: There's no intention of doing anything at this time other than what we are applying for. No new uses at the site are being proposed, and if they were to be in the future, they would require review by the Planning Board and the Commission.

Ms. Hathaway: The composting is also part of the proposal, and that's not being discussed here.

Mr. Hatch: There aren't enough composting facilities on the island, currently. While we attempted to work with local farms for food-waste composting, those efforts didn't work out.

Ms. Hathaway: Four and a half acres of cleared property is too much – please don't approve this.

Ms Elizabeth Harrington: I've written several letters; to summarize: MVRRD was given fourteen months to get the plan established.

Mr. Mascolo (to Mr. Hatch): Are we looking at a definitive design?

Mr. Hatch: Yes.

Mr. Doug Rice reviewed the proposed plan to allow for separated residential waste handling, the noise barriers and berms, the roadway design. There was some discussion related to the timeline for composting, with the conclusion that composting is not on the table at this time.

Mr. Morgan: The Planning Board could impose a sound-barrier helping to reduce noise from the composting operation.

Mr. Ben Hall: I'd like to support what the Harrington's have discussed. The DEP regulations are hundreds of pages in length, take a lawyer to understand, and allow for a doubling of the sound levels. Mr. Hall made further comments about the current sound from the site, including engine noise, backup alarms, and etc. I think it would be fair, given the proposed increase, to require the full berm to be placed now.

Mr. Nils Leaf: My concern is related to traffic: 70% of the existing traffic will be directed at my house. It will introduce new traffic noise and disturbance.

Mr. Morgan: why would the berm not be placed across the entire south bound at this time?

Mr. Hatch: The two part consideration: More trees would have to be taken out, which we're trying to limit. The walls are expensive to build. The berms require earth, and cement block in order to construct; this would be a hardship. We're happy with the conditions imposed to this point; more would impose a burden.

Mr. Searle: It's not possible to take the berm to the south-west corner of the lot?

The location of the existing wooden wall was noted on the aerial view.

Ms. Hathaway noted that stopped cars would be along the south boundary, waiting to check in and pay their fee; that would result in idling cars.

Mr. Mascolo noted the location of the attendant booth, and the capacity of the area for standing traffic.

Ms. Hathaway noted that up to 500 vehicles to be using the passenger pathway on any given day.

Mr. Hatch noted that about half of that (up to 300) are passenger autos.

There was some discussion related to potential changes to the day-to-day operation on the site that would be the result of the propose traffic reorientation.

Mr. Hatch noted that the number of trees, and distance between each, were yet to be determined. A landscaping plan is required to be provided to the MV Commission.

Ms. Eunice Youmans (Island Grown Initiative) offered to provide information related to composting.

Ms. Youmans also spoke about the safety issue that the reorientation would help to resolve.

Mr. Don Harrington: From the start, we've discussed changing the proposed "car" road further to the north.

Mr. Rice made note of the composting location, the current use of it, and emergency use of the area (for storage of brush and other materials).

There was some discussion related to the proposed location of the auto entrance road, and potential alternate paths, as well as the need for reserve space.

It was MOVED by McCourt, SECONDED by Searle

*To close the public hearing.*

VOTED: 5, 0, 0.

The hearing was closed at 6:30 PM.

### **Deliberation**

Mr. Searle: NO comments.

Ms. Morrison: I don't believe that testing water in the well will impose a hardship.

Mr. McCourt: the biggest concern is the noise factor. We're going to be monitoring that. If there's a problem we can make corrections. There are a lot of regulations to be concerned with.

Mr. Morgan: The hurricane reserve site makes sense. A berm will be along the entire south side of the lot.

Mr. Cisek: It's mandated by the state; the concern with neighbors was noted by Mr. Hatch. A huge influx of new traffic isn't expected; it's important that we make things work for all concerned.

Mr. Mascolo: This is a necessary evil; no one really wants this in their backyard, but there's not much we can do to avoid this. What about a fence along the south-west side of the roadway? The stockade fence would help with visibility and sound abatement.

Mr. Hatch agreed.

It was MOVED by McCourt, Seconded by Searle

*To approve the project as presented, with conditions as follows:*

VOTED: 5, 0, 0.

### **CONDITIONS as imposed by Decision of the MV Commission**

#### **Wastewater and Groundwater**

- 5.1 *As offered by the Applicant, the MVRRRD will install three monitoring wells down gradient of the future composting area and monitor these wells consistent with the MassDEP site monitoring requirements for the four existing wells.*
- 5.2 *The new monitoring wells shall be installed and monitoring shall commence prior to the asphaltting of the new southern access road.*
- 5.3 *As offered by the applicant, copies of test results from all monitoring wells shall be provided to the MVC.*
- 5.4 *There shall be no use of fertilizers other than that required to initially support newly planted vegetation.*

#### Open Space, Natural and Community Habitat

- 5.5 *Prior to clearing of trees for the development, the applicant shall submit a preliminary landscaping plan for the review and approval of the LUPC indicating the location along the interior side of the proposed southern access road of not less than ten trees to be retained as landscape elements. Said trees shall also be marked for identification on site, such as with colored surveyor's tape. The preliminary landscaping plan shall also graphically identify the number, location, variety and, if appropriate, size of plants to be introduced. In addition, the landscape plan shall show the location of the berm and design for the wall atop the berm and shall provide a specifications sheet for the wall color and the location of all wells.*
- 5.6 *After clearing of trees but prior to public use of the proposed facilities, the applicant shall submit a final landscaping plan for the review and approval of the LUPC, modifying elements from the preliminary landscaping plan as necessary to substantially and appropriately screen the areas of new operations from views from roadways and from abutting properties.*

#### Night Lighting and Noise

- 5.7 *As offered by the applicant, the only additional exterior illumination to the site will be a cutoff type fixture - similar to what exists on the existing buildings- installed by the doorway of the new attendants building.*
- 5.8 *As offered by the applicant to attenuate noise from the proposed facility operations in the southeastern direction, the applicant shall construct a berm to elevation 51' upon which shall be erected a 2-foot thick block wall rising six (6) feet high.*
- 5.9 *The wall shall be flush with the surface of the berm.*
- 5.10 *As offered by the applicant, the applicant shall set the volume of safety beeping when applicant's vehicles are in reverse gear to the lowest allowable volume.*
- 5.11 *Prior to tree clearing, the applicant shall conduct at the boundaries of the property baseline sound measurements of current operations. Once the new facilities are in use, the applicant shall again measure sound levels at the same boundary locations and compare the measured sound levels in order to establish compliance with MassDEP Noise Control Regulation 310 CMR 7.10. Copies of both sets of measurements shall be provided to the MVC. If use of the new facilities is not in compliance with the noise regulation, the applicant shall return to the MVC with proposals to bring it into compliance.*

#### Energy and Transportation

- 5.12 *Prior to grading, the applicant shall present for review of the LUPC an assessment of potential siting of solar arrays.*
- 5.13 *By October 2020, the MVRRRP shall present to the MVC an updated timeline with milestones on how it plans to acquire, create and operate a composting operation on the Central Facility site.*

6.1 *Permitting from the Town*

*The Applicant must, consistent with this Decision, apply to the appropriate Town of Edgartown Officers and Boards for any local development permits which may be required by law. The permit-granting authorities of the Town of Edgartown may now grant the request for approval of the Applicant's proposal in accordance with the conditions contained herein and may place further conditions thereon in accordance with applicable law, or may deny the request for approval. Any permit issued by the Town shall incorporate the plan approved by the MVC and the above conditions.*

*The Office of the Edgartown Building Inspector shall not issue any permits or approvals for public use of the proposed facilities until it has received a Certificate of Compliance issued by the Executive Director or DRI Coordinator of the Martha's Vineyard Commission confirming that conditions 5.2 and 5.6 identified in Section 5 of this Decision have been satisfied.*

*Additional Conditions of Approval*

*A stockade fence consisting of panels no less than six feet in height, shall be constructed by the applicant as follows: beginning at a point directly west of Station 12 \*, then south and east to a point roughly south of Station 19 \*. Fence shall run parallel to the "residential traffic road." Fence shall be regularly maintained and repaired so as to be kept presentable and in good condition.*

*\* as noted on a plan entitled "Circulation Improvements, panel C-8", prepared by Wright-Pierce Engineering, project #13978A, dated July, 2018*

*All sound test methodology and results shall be provided to the Town.*

*All groundwater test results shall be provided to the Town.*

VOTED: 5, 0, 0.

**5:55 PM: PUBLIC HEARING: SP (Pool) (Cont'd from January 7, 2019) - 91 WEEKS LANE (12A-17) – KLUCHNIK**

The Board continued a public hearing at the request of George Sourati, Sourati Engineering, on behalf of Jorge & Claudia Kluchnik, to construct an in-ground swimming pool, pool equipment shed, pool enclosure fence and associated utilities, in the inland zone of the Coastal District. The application was made in accordance with Sections 5.1.C and 10.1.G of the Edgartown Zoning Bylaw.

Present for the Applicant: Mr. George Sourati, Jorge & Claudia Kluchnik.

The public hearing was continued at 6:38 PM.

**Presentation:**

Mr. Finn distributed a revised site plan, showing the changes that the Board had requested at the previous session of the public hearing.

Mr. Sourati reviewed the changes as shown on the plan. No other public comment was received.

It was MOVED by Searle, SECONDED by Morrison  
*To close the public hearing.*

VOTED: 5, 0, 0.

Closed at 6:42 PM.

### **Deliberation**

Given the inclusion of the proposed changes, the Planning Board generally agreed that the proposal would result in little to no disturbance to the local neighborhood, and was otherwise in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the Bylaw.

It was MOVED by Searle SECONDED by Morrison

*To approve the application as amended, with standard conditions for swimming pools, as follows:*

#### USE and SAFETY

1. *Only the residents of the dwelling and their guests shall use the pool.*
2. *The pool shall be surrounded by a barrier, securing access to the pool in accordance with local and state Building and Health codes.*
3. *A ring buoy shall be provided with a secured safety line of a length adequate to reach all areas of the pool.*
4. *All pool equipment shall be located inside a pool house or enclosed structure for noise abatement to unless specifically waived by the SPGA.*

#### WATER

5. *Pools supplied by well water shall be filled prior to June 15 or after September 15.*
6. *Pool water shall be treated with a non-chlorinated treatment system only. Pools shall not be drained within 48 hours of any chemical treatment.*
7. *Draining or adjustment of water level shall be in accordance with Department of Health or Conservation Commission regulations, and shall not be accomplished through disposal of water into a public or private way, and shall not be allowed to cause surface ponding or flooding.*

#### LIGHTING and ENERGY

8. *Outdoor lighting is limited to that required by building code, and shall be fully shielded, and directed downward. Mercury vapor lighting and bug zappers are prohibited.*
9. *Heated pools are permitted with the recommendation the heat source is solar, geothermal or other alternative energy source.*

#### COMPLIANCE

10. *The project shall comply with any applicable Conservation Commission Order of Conditions, Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection Wetlands Order of Conditions, Board of Health regulations, and Building Code.*
11. *The responses contained within the Swimming Pool Special Permit Criteria Checklist shall become a part of this decision.*
12. *Copies of this decision shall be provided to the construction crew prior to the*

*construction of the project.*

VOTED: 5, 0, 0.

**6:00 PM: Presentation: MV Commission DRI Checklist Committee**

The planning board received the MV Commission's DRI Checklist Committee for a discussion on the proposed changes to the DRI Checklist.

Present: DRI Checklist Committee Members: Mr. Fred Hancock, Ms. Joan Malkin, Ben Robinson, Rob Doyle; also present: Ms. Christina Brown and Mr. Jim Joyce (Edgartown Representatives to MV Commission), Mr. Bill Veno (MV Commission staff).

The presentation / discussion began at 6:50 PM.

Mr Mascolo: Why are we doing this?

Mr. Hancock: over the past year or so, a number of new policies have been drawn up, or revised. Because of this, it was time to review the checklist with those items in mind, to see where those new policies could be proactively implemented. Mr. Hancock noted that some of the thresholds related to lot divisions have been lowered, because much of the larger tracts are already developed, and lot divisions will be 'filling in' – dividing existing lots into smaller parcels in order to create new homesites.

Mr. Mascolo expressed his concern with the proposed changes, stating that "We feel as though we are being usurped, that we are losing our power as a board."

Mr. Hancock: But we don't take any power away from your board at all.

Mr. Mascolo: Why do we need to add four more months (the time for the referral process) to any given project? We feel that some of these numbers don't make sense to us.

Mr. Hancock: Your focus is on Edgartown. Our focus is on the whole island. That's why we're here – to look at matters of concern to the whole island.

Ms. Christina Brown: The Commission, under its legislation, has greater authority than the town, particularly in relation to conditioning large residential developments, and similar large projects.

Mr. Morgan: People elected the Planning Boards to do the job of governing land use.

Mr. Hancock: We were just before three up-island planning boards last week, and only a single item was of concerns to those boards. Further, the executive summary noted that a great deal of topics that were left unchanged. The previous language in the DRI checklist that noted a referral is now called "Mandatory Referral".

Mr. Mascolo: When the MVC first began, it was like a 'big brother' to the town – able to help when the town needed; it now feels that the Commission is overriding the Town's judgment on more and more matters. It feels as though we're being instructed as to how things will be. I don't prefer that. With our current boards, committees and commissions, there are currently so many layers of review and oversight, and so many opportunities to restrict a given development; to add a referral to the Commission makes the process that much harder for an applicant. We have competent people who run our town. I just feel like we'll only be referring everything from this point forward.

Mr. Mascolo: I can't buy into the 'regional impact' argument, particularly when the thresholds are being lowered.

Mr. Hancock: I think that our boards worked very effectively on the Stop and Shop project. That's the feeling I got. It was a major project, and the result was good for all involved.

Mr. Morgan: Agreed: the Stop and Shop was a project of regional impact. The "Meetinghouse Way" project is another story – the offers by the applicants would have represented a significant benefit to the town with little to no impact to the island. And it was denied by the Commission...



Mr. Hancock: That project wasn't denied – the applicant withdrew the proposal.

Mr. Mascolo discussed his concerns as to why the Meetinghouse way project met with such opposition.

Ms. Brown: If the Meetinghouse Way Project is reopened, the real concern is that we don't know how much is going to be too much for the system – how many houses is too much; how many people is too much; the Commission has to take that into account.

Mr. Mascolo: Do you carry the necessary tools to make those decisions?

Ms. Brown: The Commission is supposed to have those tools.

Ms. Brown: It was Edgartown's problem to leave ½ acre zoning in the Island Grove area.

Mr. Ted Doyle: I'm the Edgartown Appointee to the committee. This is the first time I've heard some of this. What did other towns express concern with?

Mr. Hancock: Tisbury and Aquinnah expressed concern about the 'large house' threshold. Tisbury expressed concerns related to the threshold, simply because they calculate habitable space in a different way. We're looking for feedback in terms of the triggers, whether they are too low, too high, or otherwise.

Mr. Hancock discussed the revised thresholds for houses; there was significant back-and-forth related to the energy requirements for the concurrent review.

Mr. Ted Rosbeck: Regardless of how Edgartown views this, this will continue to be part of the discussion going forward. I was part of the last DRI checklist revision; from that, the MV Builders Association was formed, in order to provide real-world information to the conversation. Much of the language is restructuring; however, some things are being lowered, as they were at the last go-around. Why is that the case? How many subdivisions came to the commission at the current levels? How many were missed? Are the current regulations inadequate? The current proposal seems to be just cuts in half that seem arbitrary; was there data that suggest this be done? I'd like to see the data that supports these proposed changes. As a builder, the large-house thresholds continue to be a concern. It's back again, and has gained traction this time around. (To Reade Milne) how many houses would this capture? Within that threshold, if this were applied, will this make a minimal impact, or will it significantly increase the number of projects that would be referred to the commission? And, are the projects that might be referred really rise to the level of regional impact? How does the construction of a 5,000 square foot house on three acres in the woods rise to the level of regional impact?

Ms. Reade Milne: Between 4,000 and 8,000 square feet is the Edgartown Market. Nearly all projects would come under the proposed Section 4.1. My concern continues to be with the amount of building being done in the downtown area, and in the coastal district and other sensitive areas.

Ms. Milne: I appreciate the work of the boards, and how open they are to discuss my concerns. These changes to the DRI Checklist feels dangerously like regionalization; the changes don't seem to honor the fact that Edgartown has a tradition that speaks to density, house size, etc. We have people in place on our town boards that understand this. As building commissioner, I will not hesitate to refer a project that I feel is of a regional impact; to remove that option point from the town feels like an undue burden.

Mr. Hancock: We did build in the 'trap door' for the 4,000 – 8,000 square foot proposals, provided they meet our required thresholds. We are not 'banning' larger houses, we're just trying to make projects serve the island's concerns.

Mr. Rosbeck: Even entertaining the idea of a large-house threshold as it stands, given the demonstrated history of changes to other DRI checklist thresholds, the 4,000 square foot threshold is

likely to be ‘ratcheted down’ over time.

Mr. McCourt: Ms. Milne has just taken on the role of building inspector; however, her comments are so very accurate about Edgartown. Our Town Hall is the best on the island. Everything we do is top notch; our staff is excellent. Mr. Matt Poole (Health Inspector) – you can’t get any better. Matt and Jane [Varkonda, Conservation Agent] are the best of the best. The MV Commission has been a great partner, particularly with the Stop and Shop project. However, if you have concerns about how we do business, or how we regulate development, come see us. We can make changes to our zoning bylaw.

Mr. Hancock expressed an interest in getting specific feedback on specific items, and that general dissent to the entire group of changes was not helpful.

Mr. Ben Hall: Information from the MV Commission is sometimes difficult to get; at a recent meeting, new materials were being handed out that night.

Mr. Mascolo: noted the time, and asked for final comments.

Mr. Hancock: From this point forward, the Committee will conduct additional meetings to consider feedback that they’ve received, and forward a final revision to the full Commission. A public hearing before the full Commission will allow final comments from the public.

Mr. Ezra Sherman: I applaud the commission for the sentiment behind the changes that have been proposed. As a resident, the commission would get much further lobbying the Planning Board, the Zoning Board, and other town boards, with science and reason, instead of trying to micromanage every project with something like Section 4.2 (the large-building thresholds). To try to swat at every project with this big of a net will cause some fractious opinions. Section 4.2 is a tough solution to force on a town, such as Edgartown, where it would impact a large number of development projects.

Mr. Ben Hall spoke about his concerns related to commercial development, most specifically about restaurants. Mr. Hall also spoke about his concerns related to large house regulations, and the requirements for same.

Mr. Mascolo noted his objections generally related to applying a single set of regulations to all island towns equally. Mr. Mascolo also noted that the opinions expressed by the board to the Commission seem to fall on deaf ears.

Mr. Mascolo: I think that the proposed changes are not right; they’re not a good fit for Edgartown.

Mr. Hancock: What will happen next: the committee will meet with Oak Bluffs in a couple of weeks. A final draft will be developed to go to the full Commission. A hearing will be held on that draft. The public will have an opportunity to comment.

Mr. Mascolo suggested that the commission might better serve each Town’s needs by finding out from the Towns as to what they see as needs.

There was some discussion related to the Meetinghouse Way project, how the LUPC handled the application and engaged the applicant, and what conclusions that might be drawn from that experience.

The discussion concluded at 7:55 PM. The board thanked the DRI Committee Members for their time.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **Second reading: Zoning Bylaw changes**

Mr. Finn presented a copy of the proposed zoning bylaws for a second reading, and noted that a public hearing would be scheduled for February 11, 2020, in accordance with Section 5 of Chapter

40A of the General Laws.

**Master Plan Steering Committee: Appointments**

Mr. Finn presented a summary of the applicants for membership on the Master Plan Steering Committee, as well as a ballot form.

**ADMINISTRATIVE**

**Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of November 12, December 3 and 17, and January 7 were presented for review.

**ADJOURN**

There being no further business, it was MOVED by Morrison, SECONDED by Searle  
*To Adjourn.*

VOTED: 5, 0, 0.

The meeting was declared adjourned at 7:36 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Douglas Finn,  
Administrative Assistant

APPROVED by vote of Planning Board at a regular meeting, held on	
<u>2/20</u>	(Date of vote)
<u>[Signature]</u>	Mascolo
<u>[Signature]</u>	McCourt
<u>Lucy d. Mi</u>	Morrison
_____	Morgan
<u>[Signature]</u>	Searle
<u>[Signature]</u>	Cisek (alternate)

# PLANNING BOARD

## PUBLIC MEETING SIGN-IN SHEET

MEETING DATE: 1/21/2020

Name (Please print legibly!)

Street Address

Agenda Item

Don Harrington	Watch Path	MURD
Betsy Harrington	"	"
SERGE KLUCHNIK	MORNINGSIDES TOPSFIELD	"
CLAUDIA KLUCHNIK	"	"
Kevin Selby / SoAnn Hathaway	Watch Path	MURD
Don Watcher	MURD	MURD
Douglas Rice	MURD / WILSON ST - PIERCE	MURD
Joni Jackman	Katana Rd.	MURBA
Erica Sherman	JENNEY WAY	DR1
TED ROSBERG	33 WILWELYN WAY	DR1
EUNICE YOUNG	4 BERRY AVE COARTON	MURD
FEADE MILNE	29 BETTYS LANE VT	
Ben Hall	21 Oliver Edge	MURDRI, MURRRP, <sup>Edy Zang</sup> changed