



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

JULY 17, 2019 AT 7:30 PM

LOWER TOWN HALL, 322 CONCORD ROAD, SUDBURY, MA

Members Present: Chair Stephen Garvin, Vice-Chair Charles Karustis, Secretary John Hincks, Nancy Kilcoyne, and Justin Finnicum

Others Present: Director of Planning and Community Development Adam Duchesneau

Mr. Garvin opened the meeting at 7:30 PM

Public Hearing – Site Plan Review, Stormwater Management Permit and Water Resource Protection Overlay District Special Permit – 554 Boston Post Road (Assessor’s Map K06-0602)

Quentin Nowland of 554 BPR LLC; Vito Colonna, Engineer from Sullivan Connors & Associates, Inc.; Bob Pouliot, President of Boardwalk Storage Solutions, LLC; Bill Dickinson, from Dickinson Architects, LLC and Chair of the Acton Historical Commission; and Kathy Schreiber, Landscape Architect, were present to discuss the proposed project with the Planning Board.

Mr. Karustis read the legal notice into the record. Mr. Garvin stated the Applicant was applying for three different permits: a Site Plan Review Permit, a Stormwater Management Permit, and a Water Resource Protection Overlay District Special Permit.

Mr. Nowland presented the aerial view and bird’s eye view of 554 Boston Post Road in relationship to Boston Post Road, the Meadow Walk development, and J.P. Bartlett’s Wholesale Greenhouse. Mr. Nowland noted the project site is only three acres along Boston Post Road and stated the remainder of the property would remain as it is.

Mr. Nowland stated the displayed views depicted the Stone Tavern, the farm stand, the barn itself, and several other structures. He also presented 3-D photo renderings of the proposed barn, storage facility, and the Stone Tavern (with non-historical portions being demolished). Mr. Nowland stated three neighborhood meetings had taken place and he had listened to all comments as well as the recommendations of Zoning Board of Appeals. He added the proposed storage facility office would be located in the Stone Tavern.

Mr. Nowland agreed to remove the existing cupola from the barn and have it set on display as a historic landmark to the west of the farm stand.

Mr. Colonna detailed the elements of parking, fire equipment access/turnaround, security, fencing, utilities, and stormwater considerations. He maintained several modifications had been made per the recommendations from the Horsley Witten Group and Town staff. Mr. Colonna explained the existing gravel pathway was covering the easement to the back of the property.

Mr. Pouliot indicated the design of the proposed barn would mimic the style of the existing barn. He detailed the site elevations, height of the building, renderings, fencing, and lighting as proposed.

At this time Mr. Hincks arrived at the meeting.

Mr. Dickinson presented the plans for the Stone Tavern building and stated the barn was fairly stable but rotted in areas where water was leaking in. He spoke of the historical significance of the William Stone Tavern and highlighted the proposed renovation would preserve and improve the 1804 footprint of the Tavern. Mr. Dickinson provided details regarding the materials to be used in the historic renovation of the Tavern and reiterated the Historic Districts Commission would partner in the renovation process.

Mr. Nowland presented traffic studies of the area as completed by Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. for the property. Ms. Schreiber presented the landscape plan and stated an Earth Day tree, and several other trees and bushes at the front of the property would be preserved. She noted the evergreen row between the property and Whole Foods would be retained, and spoke of existing and proposed fencing along the property line. Ms. Schreiber provided details regarding vegetation to be added closer to the proposed building and noted gravel stone would be used with pathways around the site to maintain the historical character.

Mr. Nowland noted the Design Review Board had suggested more shade trees be added to the project and also confirmed additional storage areas would be provided as suggested by Town staff.

Mr. Duchesneau highlighted several comments from Design Review Board including the following:

- There were an excessive number of cupolas on the storage building
- Modification of paint colors and clapboard materials
- Smaller tree plantings to break up the roof line
- Pedestrian access from Boston Post Road/Route 20

Mr. Duchesneau explained the Fire Department had requested a condition which called for the installation of an asphalt base around the building before construction began. He presented recommendations from the Horsley Witten Group's peer review. Mr. Duchesneau mentioned there were some 20 possible conditions for the project, including hours of operation, timing of construction, location of underground utilities, prohibition of exterior storage, future status of the Stone Tavern building, and preservation of the cupola. He also noted the Applicant was requesting a waiver from the fees associated with the application.

Mr. Finnicum inquired about all access points to the property. Mr. Nowland responded an easement would be shared between the J.P. Bartlett's Wholesale Greenhouse property and the subject property. He also indicated a wooded access existed in the back of the property to access the rear 57 acres from Horse Pond Road. Mr. Finnicum asked about the width of the proposed easement. Mr. Colonna stated the width varied but was 20 feet at the widest point. Mr. Finnicum recommended the easement allow for two car lanes.

With regard to a possible reduction of impervious pavement, Mr. Finnicum asked about the setback of the structure from Boston Post Road/Route 20. Mr. Nowland responded the initial proposal considered the sufficient spacing for the Stone Tavern and the engineers considered safety, traffic flow, and existing topography in effort not to create additional soil disturbance.

Mr. Finnicum mentioned the possibility of moving the building to the eastern property line, thereby providing circulation only on the west side of the building, which might reduce impervious pavement by approximately 30%. Mr. Colonna stated several options were examined but access was needed around the building, especially with regard to fire protection and emergency access. Mr. Nowland and Mr. Colonna described other alternate proposals which were rejected.

Mr. Finnicum asked for further explanation of the proposed fencing off of Boston Post Road/Route 20. Mr. Colonna outlined the proposed fencing area and added it was 105 feet away from Boston Post Road/Route 20.

Mr. Finnicum noted the renderings did not depict utility lines along Boston Post Road/Route 20 and wanted clarification that all utilities on site and along Boston Post Road/Route 20 would be placed underground. Mr. Colonna stated the overhead wiring along Boston Post Road/Route 20 would remain. Mr. Finnicum asked if the Applicant might consider installing underground wiring along Boston Post Road/Route 20. Mr. Colonna responded that proposal would be a huge undertaking.

Mr. Finnicum commented on the proposed architectural material and suggested using granite, which would be more in keeping with Sudbury.

Ms. Kilcoyne expressed interest in performing an archeological dig and asked if the Applicant would consider a supervised dig to perform several test pits around the barn and the house to perhaps discover artifacts. Mr. Nowland responded in the affirmative and asked what the timing would be regarding such a study. Ms. Kilcoyne replied the timing would be dependent on the digging crew but would not take much time.

Ms. Kilcoyne felt the size of the proposed building was excessive and noted the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) was over 0.7. She maintained the industry standard suggested a building of that size was more in keeping with a five acre development site and three acres averaged buildings of approximately 40,000 square feet. She asked a reduction in the size of the building be considered.

Ms. Kilcoyne noted self-storage facilities have issues with emergency egresses and asked for consideration of including interior windows within the corridor for additional ventilation. She indicated there could be potential problems with rat infestation in such storage facilities, which might be indicative of the types of items stored in the building.

Mr. Duchesneau stated there was a condition to prohibit any type of exterior storage. Ms. Kilcoyne suggested limiting storage and excluding storage of construction materials, chemicals, animals and related supplies (foods, etc.), and tires.

Ms. Kilcoyne inquired about the groundwater aspect and the possibility of lowering the elevation of the site. Mr. Colona commented those considerations were reviewed by the team and the plans reflect achieving the lowest elevation possible.

Ms. Kilcoyne inquired about who would be running the farm stand. Mr. Nowland stated a woman had been running the farm stand for many years and his company had experience running farm stands as well. He noted if the woman could not continue running the stand, his team would manage it.

Ms. Kilcoyne asked about the designated site for the cupola. Mr. Nowland responded the proposal was to place the cupola just to the west of the farm stand.

Mr. Hincks asked about metal roofing in the Town, which was also being proposed for the self-storage building. Mr. Garvin stated Herb Chamber Range Rover and Whole Foods utilized metal roofing.

Mr. Karustis stated he had concerns about the prominence of the metal roofing and wondered what the associated glare would be like. He indicated he preferred visual simulations rather than renderings. Mr. Karustis suggested angling the building in order to decrease impervious surfaces. Mr. Nowland commented the possible glare from the roofing came up at the Design Review Board meeting. Mr. Pouliot suggested a darker material with mat finish might help in this regard and is currently under consideration. Mr. Karustis mentioned that without two curb cuts, perhaps more vegetation could be established around the barn.

Mr. Karustis then asked if solar installation was being considered. Mr. Nowland responded in the affirmative adding he conferred with Key Solar and would have renderings which could be presented at the next meeting.

Mr. Garvin recommended the Applicant reexamine the soil calculations per a recommendation in the peer review, which might alter stormwater calculations. Mr. Garvin stated he would like to see water quality standards for the given volume and treatment.

Mr. Garvin then asked if the proposed parking spaces were allocated for the self-storage building alone. Mr. Colonna replied the parking spaces were just for the self-storage building. Mr. Garvin stated he would also want to see how water would be captured under the pea stone parking spaces. Mr. Garvin agreed that solar panels would be a good addition but wondered if they would affect the building's overall height. He suggested the Applicant get back to the Planning Board regarding that item.

In regard to a waiver for the Site Plan Review and Stormwater Management Permit application fees, Mr. Garvin asked if there were fees associated with any of the other permits. Mr. Duchesneau responded the Applicant had paid all other fees for the application and was not requesting waivers from any other payments. Mr. Garvin asked if the easement was going to be an area which the Fire Department wanted plowed in the winter. Mr. Nowland replied the Fire Department had not made that request.

The Planning Board then discussed the Applicant's request to waive the Site Plan Review and Stormwater Management Permit application fees.

Mr. Garvin asked the members of the Planning Board if they were in favor of waiving the application fees for the Site Plan Review and Stormwater Management Permit applications. A roll call vote was taken on the matter as follows: Karustis – No, Hincks – No, Kilcoyne – No, Finnicum – No, and Garvin – No.

Mr. Garvin then asked if there were any members of the public who wanted to speak to the application.

Andrea Holland of 31 Woodland Road stated the site was in a residential zone and wanted the Planning Board to take that fact into consideration. She suggested more evergreen shrubs be added and the Planning Board pay close attention to the proposed hours of operation. Ms. Holland requested the Planning Board condition loading/unloading at the site to be restricted to only the interior of the building. Mr. Garvin commented that hours of operation are proposed for 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Saturdays and Sundays.

Mr. Finnicum asked if there was a time limit for how long people could stay at the storage facility, or if they could stay within their container and run a business or anything of that nature. Mr. Nowland stated each customer would sign a contract indicating they would adhere to the basic rules of the facility.

Diana Warren of 32 Old Framingham Road maintained the back 56 acres have been held in an Agricultural Preservation Restriction in perpetuity since the 1984 Town Meeting. She added the statement made regarding regulation against further development there was incorrect, as the language of the restriction allowed for the development of structures and buildings such as a farm house or home. She noted those buildings would have to be approved by the state Department of Agriculture. Ms. Warren stated she felt the massing of the project was excessive and the tavern would be overpowered by the size of the self-storage building. She stated the Tavern and barn proposals were currently before the Historical Commission and going through the Demolition Delay Bylaw process. She touched on several architectural aspects including:

- Staggering shakes were not colonial, nor historically appropriate
- The number of cupolas was excessive and not historical
- Metal roofs were not historical
- Farm stand spatial relationship was “fake history”

Mr. Garvin reiterated the Planning Board’s suggestion of an FAR of 0.3 to 0.5.

Ms. Warren stressed the importance of the archeological dig and emphasized the tavern might have been there before the American Revolution. She noted the building was dated 1804 because it was cited in an 1804 Farmer’s Almanac.

Ann McAdam of 925 Boston Post Road stated most of the older barns in Vermont have metal roofs and dairy barns might have multiple cupolas. She maintained the proposed building looked great and was an improvement over what is there now. Ms. McAdam maintained the project developers had done a good job and noted stormwater management and infiltration would be vastly improved.

Mr. Garvin stated there would be at least one more public hearing concerning the project. Mr. Nowland and Mr. Colonna agreed to continuation of the hearing.

Mr. Duchesneau noted Mr. Garvin and Mr. Finnicum had stated they could not make the August 14, 2019 meeting. Mr. Hincks and Mr. Karustis were not sure of their scheduling availability on August 14, 2019. Mr. Duchesneau recommended the Stone Farm public hearing be held on August 21, 2019.

Mr. Hincks motioned to continue the public hearing for the Site Plan Review, Stormwater Management Permit, and Water Resource Protection Overlay District Special Permit for 554 Boston Post Road (Assessor’s Map K06-0602) to August 21, 2019. Mr. Karustis seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 5-0.

Immediately Continued Public Hearing – Site Plan Review Request for Modification – 155 -159 Woodside Road (Assessor’s Map M09-0500)

Mr. Hincks motioned to continue the public hearing for the Site Plan Review Request for Modification for 155-159 Woodside Road (Assessor’s Map M09-0500) to the next Planning Board meeting on August 14, 2019. Mr. Karustis seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 5-0.

Interviews for Planning Board Associate Member

Mr. Hincks stated he and the Planning Board were pleased to see so many applications for the Associate Member position.

John Baranowsky, 103 Belcher Drive

Mr. Baranowsky stated he had lived in Sudbury for 45 years and ran for Planning Board twenty years ago. The candidate who was elected to the position at that time was now State Representative Carmine Gentile. Mr. Baranowsky stated he is currently on two committees – the Route 20 Wastewater Group and the Educational Options Committee. He noted he is a civil engineer and provided several references.

Mr. Hincks asked Mr. Baranowsky what he felt was the number one issue the Planning Board could have influence over. Mr. Baranowsky responded by naming Camp Sewataro, the Fairbank Community Center, and the Master Plan.

Michael W. Dziekan, 48 Raynor Road

Mr. Dziekan stated he had lived in Sudbury for 18 years and was a concerned citizen with a background in civil engineering. He indicated the most pressing issue was the purchase of Camp Sewataro, which he indicated was without a plan, as well as the Boston Post Road/Route 20 Fire Station and the Senior Center. Mr. Dziekan indicated Sudbury spends money without much thought to the long-term effects. Mr. Dziekan spoke about Stone Farm and added that metal roofs shed snow.

Mr. Karustis asked Mr. Dziekan if he was aware of the implementation of the new Master Plan for the Town. Mr. Dziekan stated he was not aware of that aspect. Mr. Garvin responded there was a Board dedicated to the Master Plan update process and there had been a Master Plan Public Forum in May of 2019. Mr. Garvin asked Mr. Dziekan what he might do to make the public more aware of the Master Plan update process. Mr. Dziekan stated he would advertise in the Town Crier and suggested the Sudbury Patch might also be used for public outreach.

Anuraj Shah, 257 Concord Road

Mr. Shah stated he has worked as an architect and construction manager for institutional/residential projects, and had experience with stormwater management and other planning issues. Mr. Shah indicated he closely follows Town Meeting topics and had been active in other Town committees, such as attending Zoning Board of Appeals, Historic Districts Commission, and Historical Commission meetings. He felt the Town had done good work to this point, but needed to focus on how to effectively update and serve the population.

Mr. Hincks asked Mr. Shah if he had worked on a non-Sudbury project which might be worth emulating in Sudbury. Mr. Shah felt the Meadow Walk development was more successful than the project in downtown Wayland from both visibility and pedestrian access aspects. He mentioned Lynnfield Marketplace could be a worthy model. He also spoke of University Avenue in Westwood and that project's activation of the streetscape.

Michael Staas, 67 Carriage Way

Mr. Staan stated he had bought a house in the town in February, had a young family, and felt Sudbury had a great school system. He indicated the colonial character/charm and accessibility to commercial areas attracted him to Sudbury. Mr. Staan stated he was the Chief Operating Officer for an Ashland-based company and runs global operations managing of 2,000 team members speaking many different languages. He maintained he was a great facilitator, motivator, and leader, and was interested in being a Planning Board member in order to drive the community forward.

Mr. Karustis asked Mr. Staan if he had any experience in planning or land use. Mr. Staan responded he was a land user and would seek to find a way to take advantage of the Town's beauty and not diminish it.

John Sugrue, 23 Kay Street

Mr. Sugrue stated he was an urban planner and architect who resided in Sudbury with his young family for 5 years. He added he was currently the chair for the Master Plan Steering Committee (MPSC) and was involved with the current planning for the Town. Mr. Sugrue indicated the key to the Master Plan was effective implementation and after the MPSC disbanded, he would like to carry on that mission by being a member of the Planning Board. Mr. Sugrue emphasized he currently worked with the topics that the Planning Board dealt with and wanted to help guide the future of the Town.

Mr. Hincks thanked Mr. Sugrue for his contribution to the MPSC and asked what surprised him about the work on the Master Plan. Mr. Sugrue responded the level of interest had surprised him and many communities were not as engaged as Sudbury.

Mr. Karustis asked if there were related areas that Sudbury could improve upon when compared to other communities. Mr. Sugrue responded making the Town more accessible, walkable, and trail and bicycle friendly were areas for improvement.

Mr. Garvin thanked the Applicants and stated the Planning Board would be discussing the appointment publicly at their next meeting. He added all candidates had an opportunity to contribute to the Master Plan update process.

Melone Property/Quarry North Update

Developer Chris Claussen was present to provide an update on the project to the Planning Board. Mr. Claussen presented several project updates which had occurred since the May 2019 Town Meeting including:

- Adoption of the 40R Zoning Overlay District by the state
- The Sudbury Water District property being offered to the Town via the Board of Selectmen
- LEC Environmental had flagged wetland boundaries (primarily in Concord) and Quarry North would present a request to Conservation Commission regarding an emergency access route
- Completed existing conditions for the whole site
- Established monitoring well locations
- Currently working on securing a hydro-geological permit from the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP)

Mr. Finnicum asked when the monitoring wells were installed and how long they would be monitored. Mr. Claussen responded he did not know how long the monitoring wells would be in place and those that

Quarry North had installed had been in place less than 60 days. He indicated 180 days was the minimum observation time and added there were additional wells throughout the site because of TCE.

Mr. Garvin asked how relocation of the leaching fields might affect the layout of the proposed housing. Mr. Claussen responded it might displace some 10 townhouses in that area and might require changing two-unit duplexes into three-unit duplexes. He added the overall impervious surface would not change.

Mr. Claussen stated he had met with a Concord Water District official, Vin Roy, Superintendent of the Sudbury Water District, and the consultant, Dr. Chang. He stated the draft hydro-geological report would be submitted to that group on Monday for their review before submission to MassDEP. Mr. Claussen noted such turnaround was typically 45 days after submittal, pending no further requests. At that time the groundwater discharge application would be presented. He stated an Environmental Notification Form (ENF) would have to be filed with the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) Office because the project is in a Zone 2 and the volume exceeds the cutoff rate.

Mr. Claussen referred to the Site Plan graphic and stated several Approval Not Required (ANR) Plans would be required to document boundaries. He also noted that to meet the Zoning Bylaw setback requirements, some Concord land would be purchased by Quarry North.

Mr. Garvin commented that the Planning Board would be the permitting authority for the 40R permit.

Mr. Garvin asked if there would be any permits needed from the Town of Concord and Mr. Claussen replied he did not believe so because his team had not figured out how to develop that piece of the property.

Mr. Karustis inquired about the timing of the site plan. Mr. Claussen replied that when the hydro-geological report was approved, that would commence the civil engineering work process and he hoped to break ground by next year. Mr. Claussen stated the groundwater discharge process took the most time.

Camp Sewataro/Liberty Ledge Subdivision Proposal Discussion

Mark Taylor of 5 Liberty Ledge and Owner of Camp Sewataro, and Attorney Cathy Netburn of D'Agostine, Levine, Parra, and Netburn PC were present for the discussion with the Planning Board.

Mr. Taylor distributed additional maps to the Planning Board and stated he was concerned his house and lots would not have legal frontage. He detailed the areas on the map that would be sold to the Town. He said he had spoken to Mark Herwick and was asking if the Planning Board had any thoughts regarding how to solve this issue.

Mr. Garvin stated the lots currently had the necessary frontage. Mr. Duchesneau confirmed that statement and added the Town would take ownership of the Greystone Lane right-of-way extending to the south. He stated he had met with Mr. Taylor who owned lots 225, 226, and 211, and who was seeking feedback from the Planning Board.

Ms. Netburn stated Mr. Taylor was hoping to be able to build a house on lot 227 which would be a combination of lots 226 and 211, and he may want to build on lot 208 as well.

Mr. Karustis stated the Planning Board was considering the future implications of such a proposal. Ms. Netburn commented there would probably not be a reason to extend the proposed development. Mr.

Karustis responded the Planning Board needed to consider all potential implications for extended development.

Mr. Garvin noted the Applicant would have to come before the Planning Board if additional impervious surface were proposed. Mr. Taylor noted all the drainage for the entire subdivision was previously installed.

Ms. Kilcoyne asked if the lots would be developed in the near future. Mr. Taylor responded construction was not eminent but should be addressed now from an approval point of view.

Mr. Garvin stated the Planning Board could provide comments but could not determine anything without a formal application in place. Mr. Taylor asked if an easement over Greystone Lane would be the best scenario. Ms. Netburn mentioned there was an existing easement on the unconstructed parts of Greystone Lane and asked if the easement approach would be best.

Mr. Garvin asked if the easement proposed would be implemented for the purpose of frontage. Ms. Netburn confirmed that statement. Mr. Garvin replied he would not be in favor of such an easement because it would be setting a precedent. An associated discussion continued. Mr. Garvin asserted the conversation was not a debate, there was no formal application currently before the Planning Board, and ended the discussion.

Mr. Hincks motioned to continue the Planning Board meeting beyond the normal adjournment time of 9:30 p.m. Mr. Karustis seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 5-0.

Master Plan Update

Mr. Duchesneau noted the MPSC had sponsored a Master Plan information table at the Touch-A-Truck event last week with significant foot traffic and responses to survey questions. He indicated Environmental Planner Beth Suedmeyer, Selectman Janie Dretler, MPSC member Nathalie Forssell, and others were present to staff the table.

Mr. Duchesneau stated Town Services would be the topic to be addressed at the next MPSC meeting.

505 Boston Post Road – Minor Site Plan Review

Janice Walden of Meridian Associates, Inc. was present to discuss the application with the Planning Board. Ms. Walden presented the site design for Sudbury Plaza and explained a hardware store would be taking over the space previously housed by a bank with a drive-through. In order to accommodate the hardware store, Gravestar, Inc. (the property owner) was proposing to repurpose the drive-through area for use as an outdoor garden center. The project called for the installation of a fence and closing of the drive-through.

Ms. Walden explained closing the drive-through should not affect the traffic patterns at the property. Ms. Kilcoyne asked what was between the parking spaces and the proposed gate. Ms. Walden indicated a landscaped island was proposed. Ms. Walden then distributed and read a listing of products to be sold in the outside part of the hardware store.

Mr. Finnicum asked if the proposed swale would interrupt any pedestrian pathway and Ms. Walden responded it would not. Mr. Finnicum noted certain parking spaces would not have direct sidewalk

passage to the interior of the store. Mr. Garvin asked if there were any entrances in the back of the store and Ms. Walden indicated there were not.

Mr. Garvin asked if it would be possible to install a gate in the back of the garden center in order for people to use the garden center as access point to the business. Ms. Walden responded she would ask the client about that aspect. Mr. Hincks asked who parked behind the building. Mr. Karustis suggested the parking might be for employees and asked if fencing would be installed around the whole area. Ms. Walden stated fencing would be included in the area where goods were being sold. Mr. Hincks commented the proposed projected reflected an improvement over what was there now. Mr. Duchesneau noted the proposed plan would decrease impervious surface by approximately 122 square feet.

Mr. Karustis stated he had no issue with the minor change. Mr. Garvin asked if mulch sold there could work its way into the swale and perhaps the catch basin. Ms. Walden replied the Conservation Commission had related concerns and added a condition which dictated that any product which could erode, must be stored inside the building.

Mr. Hincks motioned to approve the Minor Site Plan Review for 505 Boston Post Road. Mr. Karustis seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 5-0.

Special Town Meeting Zoning Bylaw Discussion

Mr. Duchesneau stated the Board of Selectmen had voted there would not be a fall 2019 Special Town Meeting. He indicated work could continue regarding the inclusionary Zoning Bylaw for presentation at the May 2020 Town Meeting.

Sidewalk/Walkway Planning and Implementation Process

Mr. Duchesneau indicated the Town was moving forward with the Complete Streets initiative and the kick-off meeting with the consultant was July 24, 2019. He stated a Complete Streets Committee would be formed consisting of primarily Town staff.

Administrative Report

Mr. Duchesneau stated candidates were being interviewed for the Planning and Zoning Coordinator position in the Planning and Community Development Department.

Minutes for Approval: May 15, 2019

Mr. Hincks motioned to approve the minutes of May 15, 2019. Mr. Karustis seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 5-0.

Future Meeting Schedule: August 21, 2019 and September 11, 2019

Mr. Duchesneau noted the second meeting scheduled for November was Thanksgiving eve and he would not be present. He suggested the Planning Board might consider rearranging the schedule and the Board agreed to decide on an alternate meeting date in the future.

Mr. Garvin adjourned the meeting at 10:16 p.m.