



Town of Sudbury

Planning Board

PlanningBoard@sudbury.ma.us

Flynn Building
278 Old Sudbury Road
Sudbury, MA 01776
978-639-3387
Fax: 978-443-0756

www.sudbury.ma.us/planning

MINUTES

FEBRUARY 13, 2019 AT 7:30 PM

LOWER TOWN HALL, 322 CONCORD ROAD, SUDBURY, MA

JOINT MEETING WITH THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Members Present: Chairman Stephen Garvin, Vice Chairman Peter Abair, and Clerk John Hincks.

Members Absent: Charles Karustis, Nancy Kilcoyne, and Associate Member Justin Finnicum.

Others Present: Director of Planning and Community Development Adam Duchesneau and Environmental Planner Beth Suedmeyer.

At 7:30 PM, Mr. Garvin opened the meeting.

Public Hearing – Stormwater Management – Goodman’s Hill Road (Assessor’s Map K10-0207)

At 7:30 PM, Mr. Garvin opened the public hearing for the application and Mr. Hincks read the legal notice into the record.

Present to discuss the application with the Planning Board were Applicant Stephen Maimone of 131 Mount Vernon Street, West Roxbury, MA and engineer Vito Colonna of Sullivan, Connors & Associates, Inc.

Mr. Colonna provided a summary of the project stating the application included plans for a new five-bedroom home on an undeveloped 69,952 square foot lot. He noted approximately half of the lot was cleared and a few trees remain in the front area. Mr. Colonna indicated the stormwater plan featured a system designed to control the peak rate and volume per the bylaws. He mentioned the project had gone through several reviews with the Horsley Witten Group, the Town’s Consulting Engineer, and all comments had been addressed.

Ms. Suedmeyer stated three peer reviews from Horsley Witten had been conducted regarding the stormwater design and their last communication indicated they were satisfied with the design. She asked Mr. Colonna to speak to a resident concern regarding the stone wall along the roadway. Ms. Suedmeyer added that before Christmas vacation the Town Engineer had staked the Town’s right of way on Goodman’s Hill Road and the stone wall was within the right of way, but no disturbance of the wall had been caused by the Applicant.

Ms. Suedmeyer noted there was a stump within the stonewall but it had not been fully clarified if the stump would remain in place. She also spoke of the rain garden revisions as commented about in the second per review regarding inclusion of ground cover. Ms. Suedmeyer asked if that ground cover had

been added to the plans. Mr. Colonna replied he would include the ground cover detail and added mulch could also be utilized.

Mr. Abair asked about the proposed driveway and the rain garden, and also inquired about the turning radius and its angle. Mr. Colonna replied the driveway angle was standard for a house lot. Mr. Garvin inquired about the slope at the base of the driveway. Mr. Colonna responded that at 30 feet, a transition begins with a 10-foot curve.

Mr. Abair noted driveway runoff during construction is always a concern and typically a performance bond would be requested. Ms. Suedmeyer indicated such a bond could be added as a condition of the decision.

Mr. Hincks asked if the driveway slope was currently 9.5%. Mr. Colonna affirmed the grade was 9.5% and noted the grade could not exceed 10%. Mr. Colonna confirmed he had designed the grade to be more gradual and indicated each contour was moved a foot or two. Mr. Hincks noted trees on Town property could not be removed by the Applicant. Ms. Suedmeyer clarified the tree was not on Town property, but if the stump within the stone wall were to be removed that disruption would likely required a Scenic Road Permit.

Mr. Hincks asked about the area of the septic system having three to one slopes and wondered what type of landscaping would be included to help prevent erosion. Mr. Colonna responded that an erosion control blanket would be implemented for stabilization while the grass was getting established.

Mr. Garvin stated an As-Built Plan would be required to ensure the driveway slope was under 10%. Ms. Suedmeyer also suggested the Town Engineer check spot grades prior to driveway clearing as well.

Mr. Garvin had several drain count inquires and Mr. Colonna provided detail on the permeability testing and processes.

Henry Noer of 55 Goodman's Hill Road stated he lived across the street from the project, and had concerns about the historic stonewall and the runoff from the proposed driveway. He asked the Planning Board to consider this factor in more depth and stated runoff from across the street had impacted his property. He also submitted pictures as evidence to be reviewed.

Mr. Noer indicated since the clearing has been done, runoff from the site had increased tremendously and more runoff would mean a section of land on his property would become unusable. Mr. Noer provided the Planning Board with recent pictures of this area and stated he did not believe a catch basin could handle the runoff.

Mr. Garvin noted that if any stones on the wall or trees within the right of way were disturbed without permit/permission, all work on the project could be stopped. Stormwater measures and necessary vegetation would relieve the erosion aspect and additional methods could be used during construction.

Mr. Colonna noted the land had not been grubbed and the soil had not changed. He stated the catch basins have been sized to handle the runoff and when construction was complete, silt fencing with straw would be installed.

Mr. Garvin pointed out the project had gone through extensive engineering and stormwater management reviews, and the Board has conditioned the submission of an As-Built Plan as assurance these measures would be in place and working.

Mr. Maimone stated he would be living in the new house and would do everything he could to keep the water on his own lot.

Ms. Suedmeyer noted that with construction phasing there might be additional details in terms of slope stabilization. Mr. Garvin responded a stormwater control plan during construction would be helpful, such as sand bags or a settling basin, to keep flow from Mr. Noer's yard.

Ms. Suedmeyer added a vegetation plan was needed. Mr. Colonna replied grass and erosion fabric would be used to stabilize the soil, and native scrubs with ground cover plantings would be installed around the rain garden area. He added that foundation plantings would be decided upon later. Mr. Garvin indicated the Planning Board preferred vegetation to be native species and Mr. Hincks agreed.

Ms. Suedmeyer reviewed the discussed conditions:

- Requirement for an erosion control plan to be implemented during construction, to be reviewed and approved by the Town Engineer.
- Requirement of a performance bond under such conditions. The Town Engineer would estimate the anticipated expense for the installation of the relevant items.
- Request for native species to be planted on site.
- A revision to condition F4 requiring an As-Built Plan be provided for the Town Engineer to review regarding the slopes across the pitch of the driveway.

Mr. Garvin suggested the Applicant choose either mulch or groundcover, and include an appropriate maintenance plan for the option chosen.

Mr. Duchesneau inquired if the stormwater and erosion control plan should be conditioned as being required prior to some aspect of the project occurring. Mr. Garvin responded that ordinarily this would be the case, but because the site had already been disturbed the Planning Board wanted to see any overflow addressed as soon as possible. Mr. Colonna stated the surface area was not completely bare, so the majority of soil was being held in place and he would get the safeguards implemented as soon as possible.

Ms. Suedmeyer suggested she could present the conditioned approval draft at the next meeting but the Planning Board could vote now to implement the soil erosion aspect.

Mr. Abair made a motion to approve the Stormwater Management Permit for Goodman's Hill Road with the conditions as noted. Mr. Hincks seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 3-0.

Public Hearing – Site Plan & Stormwater Management – Joint Meeting with the Design Review Board – 83 Boston Post Road (Assessor's Map K11-0015 & K11-0099)

Present to discuss the application with the Planning Board were Attorney Joshua Fox of Rollins, Rollins and Fox; Gabe Crocker, P.E. of Crocker Design Group; Timothy Onderdonk, AIA of Regent Associates, Inc.; and Design Review Board Members Chairman Daniel Martin, Deborah Kruskal, and Susan Vollaro.

At approximately 7:45 PM, Mr. Garvin opened the public hearing.

Mr. Fox stated the application included a parcel of land on the eastern most portion of Route 20, approximately 10.5 acres in size, seven of which are covered by a Conservation Restriction granted to the Town of Wayland. He indicated approximately 3.5 acres are used for the Herb Chambers Jaguar/Land Rover of Sudbury dealership. The proposed project included upgrades to the existing building, and the removal and reconfiguration of an existing drive-up canopy. New construction would reflect a fully enclosed reception area and second floor addition with associated improvements, including landscaping and parking. The site modifications would disturb approximately 32,500 square feet of land area with a decrease in impervious surface. The lot is located in the Industrial- Zoning District of the Town of Sudbury and the Limited Commercial Zoning District in the Town of Wayland. Mr. Fox stated the lot is bisected by the Town line, with 85% of the building in Sudbury and the remainder in Wayland. He noted permitting is required in both Sudbury and Wayland.

Mr. Fox stated permitting approvals were granted by the Sudbury Board of Zoning Appeals (ZBA), the Wayland ZBA, and the Sudbury Conservation Commission. The Applicant was still seeking approval from the Sudbury Design Review Board and the Sudbury Planning Board.

Mr. Fox indicated improvements to the parking lot were also being proposed, with the existing asphalt being removed and a new upgraded drainage system being installed to reflect current stormwater standards. He mentioned several life safety improvements which would be made as recommended by the Fire Department, including an increase in the width of access areas for fire trucks. There would be two fire hydrants installed within the parking lot and additional fire safety access in the rear and front western side of the building. Mr. Fox added there would be no additional employees as this proposal just provides for better use of the building.

Mr. Crocker presented the Site Plan noting the entrance would remain in the existing location with the circular drive and parking in the same generalized area.

Mr. Garvin asked if any Sudbury Water District approvals were needed. Mr. Gabe replied he did not know the answer to that question but would investigate it further.

Mr. Crocker explained how the existing stormwater management system worked, adding that under the new stormwater design the goal was to prevent water from collecting into the corners of the parking lot and flowing into the wetlands. He noted that when completed, the parking lot would include catch basins throughout the property.

Mr. Garvin stated that according to new regulations, an underground stormwater recharge system is required. He questioned the calculations regarding a supposed decrease in impervious surface. Mr. Crocker replied there were some incorrect calculations, but he made the corrections to display there was a decrease in impervious surface.

Ms. Suedmeyer stated she had provided a memo which reflected the updated calculations.

Mr. Crocker indicated he provided the peer reviewer with an acknowledgement letter and stated the plan would be updated to address those recommendations.

Ms. Suedmeyer noted the revised landscape plan was somewhat confusing because it was dated the same as the original plan. Mr. Crocker indicated the date of the amended landscape plan would be changed to reflect the correct date.

Ms. Suedmeyer noted the Applicant was proposing a tight tank for special discharges associated with car washing or additional hydrocarbons. Mr. Crocker stated he had submitted certification to the Town of Wayland identifying the tight tank and the floor drain system would comply with the bylaw requirements.

Mr. Abair questioned if the dealership would be open during construction and if the construction entrance would be used by service people during that time. Mr. Crocker responded that typically the Herb Chambers company keeps the service area open all the time, with daily oversight by the contractor. He explained that a paved lane would be designated so the service area could remain open. Mr. Abair stated he did not understand how the public would be able to get around during the construction. Mr. Crocker responded the contractors would phase the construction and the phasing associated with the underground drainage system would be cut and worked on first, in order to install the drainage and the utilities.

Mr. Fox indicated that although the proposed phasing did not address the problem entirely, the Bentley dealership next door could allow the Applicant to share their parking lot during construction. Mr. Hincks stated the Planning Board was awaiting the Applicant's response to the Horsley Witten peer review and asked about Standard 5 regarding projects with land uses having higher potential pollutant loads (LUHPPL). Mr. Hincks wondered how the Applicant could adhere to Standard 5 and Mr. Crocker responded cars would not be washed on site. Mr. Fox clarified the vehicles would not be washed outside of the building but there was an interior washing mechanism with a tight tank.

Mr. Hincks queried about a drainage easement. Mr. Crocker responded there was an existing drain pipe from the front of the property which directed water to the back of the parking lot for discharge.

Mr. Fox added Standard 5 addressed the washing of commercial vehicles, such as large fleet trucks. Mr. Hincks agreed there was some associated vagueness. Mr. Crocker acknowledged the question was valid, but the dealership did not meet the fleet vehicle criteria mentioned in Standard 5.

Mr. Garvin inquired about the related determination of the Wayland Planning Board. Attorney Fox replied the Wayland Town Planner sat in on the Wayland Design Board meeting, and the Wayland Zoning Board of Appeals had jurisdiction and approved the Site Plan.

Mr. Garvin stated that because there was a proposed increase in the size of the building, there would be an increase in the flow. Mr. Crocker responded he had prepared a formal Title 5 design flow review as requested by the Board of Health. Mr. Garvin indicated the proposed maintenance plan will hopefully serve both the Board of Health septic system requirements and the stormwater system requirements, ensuring the systems are better cared for going forward. He added the Planning Board would look for annual maintenance reports on the two systems, as completed by an engineer, which was the protocol.

Mr. Garvin asked about a lighting plan. Mr. Crocker explained the lighting plan with LED fixtures.

Mr. Abair asked where the reduction of impervious surface was proposed. Mr. Crocker affirmed the main area of reduction was in the rear corner of the site, along the test track, and around the parking lot islands. Mr. Abair stated the Planning Board rarely saw such detailed plans displaying the turning radius for fire trucks and applauded the project team for providing this detail.

Mr. Onderdonk explained the architectural aspects of the project, stating the existing dealership was currently overcrowded and additions for break areas and administrative areas on the second floor were referenced.

Mr. Martin stated he understood corporate architecture and standards were being following, but noted some variability in design was permitted. He indicated the design appeared to be top heavy and inquired about options to lessen that appearance. Mr. Onderdonk responded the appearance was different due to there being two floors.

Ms. Vollaro commented on the sloped roof and inquired about the height of the existing building. Mr. Onderdonk indicated the current height of the building was 30 feet and 1.5 inches, and pointed out the new building would be lower in height. He also noted Jaguar had worked with this particular dealership to balance the needs of the Applicant and the corporate image.

Mr. Martin stated there were ways to minimize the heaviness of the top portion of the building and discussion ensued. Ms. Vollaro agreed the building appeared to be top heavy, but she did like the way the garage was stepped back which took away from the massiveness.

Mr. Hincks asked if there was an elevation view from Route 20/Boston Post Road. Mr. Onderdonk affirmed the plan rendering depicted this view. Mr. Crocker noted the rendering looked very different without the landscaping and a discussion ensued.

Ms. Kruskal stated the proportioning of the building was somewhat off and suggested more window space in the front of the building. Mr. Onderdonk indicated by doing this, the front of the building would not line up with the sides. Ms. Kruskal recommended making alterations to the façade with windows and Mr. Onderdonk responded that such changes would depend upon the determination of the Jaguar design team.

Mr. Fox stated he did not feel the rendering was a fair representation because it did not display the landscaping in front of the building. Mr. Garvin felt including the landscaping in this presentation might help. Ms. Kruskal felt there was actually not much landscaping currently present. Mr. Fox noted this landscape plan was used as a landscaping model for other dealerships. He suggested the Applicant could go back to the manufacturer and request modifications. Mr. Martin stated he would strongly recommend modifications. Mr. Fox replied if some changes could be made within the existing plan, then the team would do their best to carry it forth.

Mr. Fox indicated the Applicant would arrange to meet with the Design Review Board on February 27, 2019 to present any possible design options.

Ms. Vollaro asked about the parking lot and how someone could get from the parking lot to inside the building. Mr. Crocker stated a crosswalk and sidewalk system would be implemented, and explained the related grading system. Ms. Vollaro asked if steps could be incorporated into the retaining wall and Mr. Crocker replied the inclusion of steps would be reviewed.

Ms. Kruskal inquired about the vegetation at the rear of the property and Mr. Crocker responded it was switch grasses, eastern red cedar, and mountain laurel. Ms. Kruskal noted switch grasses would not keep the plowed snow from going into the adjacent wetlands and wondered where the snow would go. Mr. Crocker responded snow removal would be managed on site and if too much snow accumulated it would be hauled away.

Mr. Abair noted that for Sudbury, this is a big structure, and is different from what is there now. He affirmed the Planning Board would probably not recommend rebuilding on the site. Mr. Abair indicated other large buildings in Sudbury had better visual designs in terms of their massiveness in appearance. He mentioned the Whole Foods building incorporated the design suggestions from the Town and the results were very pleasing. He recommended the Applicant come back with some different ideas.

Ms. Vollaro noted another striking feature about the building was that it is very close to Route 20/Boston Post Road and the buildings discussed earlier are more setback from the roadway. Mr. Fox stated the subject building was setback 47 feet from Route 20/Boston Post Road.

Mr. Hincks motioned to continue the public hearing to February 27, 2019. Mr. Abair seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 3-0.

Ms. Suedmeyer questioned if another Joint Meeting between the Planning Board and Design Review Board would be needed. Mr. Fox felt it would be best to have two separate meetings.

At this time the Design Review Board adjourned their meeting and left the room.

Public Hearing – Scenic Road

- 220 Goodman’s Hill Road (Assessor’s Map J09-0031)

-215 Goodman’s Hill Road (Assessor’s Map J09-0035)

-187 Goodman’s Hill Road (Assessor’s Map J09-0038)

- 89 Mossman Road (Assessor’s Map D08-0012)

Mr. Hincks read the legal notice into the record. He stated the Tree Warden had indicated the following trees were found to be dead, dying, or hazardous, and a request for their removal had been duly filed by the Department of Public Works:

- Elm Tree at 220 Goodman’s Hill Road
- Oak Tree at 215 Goodman’s Hill Road
- Oak Tree at 187 Goodman’s Hill Road
- Elm Tree at 89 Mossman Road

Ms. Suedmeyer stated the Town Engineer and Tree Warden were not planning to attend the meeting, but if there were any concerns they would respond or be happy to attend a future meeting.

Mr. Garvin noted Town officials usually attended Planning Board meetings where they had an application in front of the Board. He requested confirmation from Ms. Suedmeyer the itemized trees were dead. Ms. Suedmeyer indicated she had no further details regarding the matter, but knew the Tree Warden had held a public hearing, had submitted the application to remove the trees, and requested the Planning Board’s consideration.

Mr. Hincks noted there was a power line displayed in each of the photos which had been submitted.

Mr. Abair stated three of the trees looked dead and one of the trees was tilting at an approximately 55-degree angle. He indicated both Goodman’s Hill Road and Mossman Road were narrow roads, and all of the subject trees appeared to be right up against the roadway.

Ben Fisher of 207 Goodman's Hill Road stated he was hoping the Tree Warden would be in attendance to ask him some questions. He requested to see the pictures of the subject trees and asked if residents had suggested the removal of the trees. Mr. Abair stated the tree removals were requested by residents, as described in the packet.

Mr. Fisher inquired about the width of the right-of-way. Ms. Suedmeyer responded it varied for each roadway and different sections of a roadway could vary as well.

Mr. Garvin asked Ms. Suedmeyer to recommend to Town officials they attend meetings where they are going to present applications at a public hearing.

Mr. Fisher suggested more detail regarding such matters be presented at a public hearing or on the Town website. Mr. Garvin stated when an application is submitted, a notification of the hearing is posted on the Town website and a legal notice is advertised in the local newspaper.

Mr. Hincks asked Mr. Fisher what were his specific concerns. Mr. Fisher replied there was a dead tree in front of his property with rotten limbs which fell after any kind of storm. He affirmed he had called National Grid regarding the tree and inquired as to why these limited few subject trees were selected for removal. Mr. Fisher stated Goodman's Hill Road was a beautiful scenic road, but part of tree preservation involved maintaining the healthy trees and removing the dead trees. Mr. Garvin agreed that such a balance was important.

Mr. Fisher stated he would greatly appreciate any related information that could be provided in the future.

Mr. Abair motioned to approve the Scenic Road application to remove the 18" diameter Elm tree at 220 Goodman's Hill Road. Mr. Hincks seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 3-0.

Mr. Abair motioned to approve the Scenic Road application to remove the 30" diameter Oak tree at 215 Goodman's Hill Road. Mr. Hincks seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 3-0.

Mr. Abair motioned to approve the Scenic Road application to remove the 30" diameter Oak tree at 187 Goodman's Hill Road. Mr. Hincks seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 3-0.

Mr. Abair motioned to approve the Scenic Road application to remove the 32" diameter Elm tree at 89 Mossman Road. Mr. Hincks seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 3-0.

Continued Public Hearing – Stormwater Management – 621 Boston Post Road (Assessor's Map J10-0612)

In attendance to discuss the application with the Planning Board was Michael DiModica, Contractor for Applicant.

Mr. DiModica stated he had written a letter to Ms. Suedmeyer and followed the Planning Board's suggestion regarding the retaining wall surface area. He affirmed the area had been recalculated with a total of 321 square feet and, with the removal of impervious surface at the back of the building, there would be a net decrease of nine square feet. Mr. DiModica indicated the fencing would remain and the Board of Health confirmed there was no specific regulation concerning snow melt and infiltration. He stated additional notations were included regarding the staking of the berm.

Ms. Suedmeyer noted the comments from the Horsley Witten Group discussed at the previous Planning Board meeting had been sufficiently addressed. She stated the impervious area behind the building included the addition of two inches of gravel. Mr. DiModica affirmed a note regarding the stone was included in the plans.

Ms. Suedmeyer stated the draft decision contained highlighted sections related to standard conditions which may, or may not, be warranted in a design of this nature.

Mr. Hincks noted some of the Planning Board's conditions related to the site being managed during construction and construction was, in fact, complete. Ms. Suedmeyer mentioned the areas concerning construction monitoring, inspections, and paving.

Mr. Garvin indicated the Planning Board wanted an As-Built plan to be submitted.

Ms. Suedmeyer stated the restrictive covenant easement gave the Town the right to access the site to assure the stormwater systems were being maintained.

Mr. Abair motioned to approve the Stormwater Management Permit for 621 Boston Post Road (Assessor's Map J10-0612). Mr. Hincks seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 3-0.

Continued Public Hearing – Definitive Subdivision, Stormwater Management & Scenic Road – Powers Road (Assessor's Map B09-0001)

Mr. Garvin stated there would not be any substantive discussion regarding the Powers Road Definitive Subdivision, Stormwater Management Permit, and Scenic Road application at this meeting.

Ms. Suedmeyer indicated the Planning Board should discuss the unusual circumstance of peer review fees not being paid by the Applicant. BETA Group was the peer reviewer for this application and the Applicant had not contributed to the escrow account related to BETA Group's outside review services. Ms. Suedmeyer noted the former Director of Planning and Community Development had been involved with this contract. When Ms. Suedmeyer had discovered payment had not been made for the peer review services, she immediately called the Applicant to request payment in mid-November. Ms. Suedmeyer stated the Applicant's response on the matter was not received by the Planning Board until last week. She added she had conferred with Town Counsel on the matter and they recommended a timeline be established for payment.

Ms. Suedmeyer had sent a letter to the applicant, including such recommendation, and the Applicant responded last week. The Applicant wrote he would be following up on the matter and was still considering his options going forward. The Applicant had requested a continuance of the matter to present at the next Planning Board meeting on February 27, 2019, with a request for the review period ending March 15, 2019. Ms. Suedmeyer asked the Planning Board what steps they desired to take at this time.

Mr. Garvin stated he did not want to continue the matter any further than the February 27, 2019 meeting and noted any further continuance would be denied by the Planning Board if the delinquent funds had not been received.

Mr. Hincks pointed out the Applicant owed the Town money, even if they chose not to go forward with the project.

Mr. Abair felt it might make sense to move to a vote at the February 27, 2019 meeting to deny or approve the application if payment of the outstanding amount had not been received before that time. Mr. Garvin agreed with that assessment.

Mr. Duchesneau stated a letter would be sent to the Applicant to convey the intent of the Planning Board and to provide the Applicant with the expectations of the February 27, 2019 meeting. He noted there were different ways to collect the outstanding fees, including putting a lien on the property. Mr. Duchesneau indicated he would also have a conversation with the Applicant.

Mr. Hincks motioned to continue the public hearing for the Definitive Subdivision, Stormwater Management Permit, and Scenic Road application for Powers Road (Assessor's Map B09-0001) to February 27, 2019. Mr. Abair seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 3-0.

Immediately Continued Public Hearing – Site Plan & Stormwater Management – 8 Stone Road (Assessor’s Map K06-0303)

Mr. Hincks motioned to immediately continue the public hearing for the Site Plan and Stormwater Management Permit application for 8 Stone Road (Assessor's Map K06-0303). Mr. Abair seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 3-0.

Approval Not Required (ANR) Plan – 150 Dakin/38 Field Road (Assessor’s Map B10-0301, 0304, 0128, 0305)

Ms. Suedmeyer stated the structure and the setbacks for the structures have been added to the plan, and it was now available for the Planning Board’s endorsement.

Mr. Garvin asked if all aspects of the plan were compliant with zoning and Ms. Suedmeyer confirmed this was correct.

Mr. Duchesneau noted that above the signature block on the plan, there was a statement indicating “no determination as to compliance with regard to the zoning requirements has been made, or intended by the Planning Board endorsing this plan.”

Mr. Garvin stated the Planning Board members would endorse the plan before the end of the meeting.

Master Plan Update

Mr. Garvin noted the next Master Planning Steering Committee (MPSC) meeting would be held on Friday, February 15, 2019. Mr. Hincks stated he planned to be at that meeting. Ms. Suedmeyer added the MPSC meeting would take place at the Police Station, 75 Hudson Road at 8:45 AM, and this would be the regular venue and time going forward on the third Friday of each month.

Administrative Report

Ms. Suedmeyer welcomed the new Director of Planning and Community Development, Mr. Duchesneau.

Minutes for Approval – September 26, 2018, October 24, 2018, and November 14, 2018

Mr. Abair motioned to approve the minutes of September 26, 2018, October 24, 2018, and November 14, 2018. Mr. Hincks seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 3-0.

Meeting Schedule – February 27, 2019 & March 13, 2019

Mr. Garvin stated he might not be present at the February 27, 2019 meeting. Mr. Hincks indicated he would not be present at the March 13, 2019 meeting.

At 10:00 PM, Mr. Garvin made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Hincks seconded the motion. All members voted in favor and the meeting was adjourned.