



Town of Groveland
Economic Development
Planning & Conservation Department
Planning Board
183 Main Street
Groveland, MA 01834

Brad Ligols, Chair
Walter Sorenson, Vice-Chair
John Stokes III
Jim Bogiages
DJ McNulty
Chris Goodwin, Associate
Jason Naves, Associate

Board/Committee Name: PLANNING BOARD
Date: TUESDAY, April 18, 2023
Time of Meeting: 7:00PM
Location: Town Hall, 183 Main Street
Groveland, MA 01834

APPROVED 5-9-2023

MOTION: Sorenson moves to accept the April 18, 2023, and May 2, 2023, meeting minutes. Naves seconds the motion. Voted all in favor, the motion passes.

2023 MAY 10 AM 9:55
TOWN CLERK
RECEIVED/POSTED

TOWN OF GROVELAND

Present: Jason Naves, John Stokes III, Walter Sorenson (via Zoom), Brad Ligols

Absent: Chris Goodwin, Jim Bogiages, DJ McNulty

Staff Present: Annie Schindler (Town Planner & Conservation Agent), Lisa Mead (Town Counsel)

Public Present: Mike Dempsey, Matt Connors, Bill Holt, Brian Connell (Zoom), Costello 604 Alyssa Dr (Zoom), Dona Torres (Zoom), bagauvin (zoom), Carol Melcher (Zoom), Patricia Smith (Zoom), Marie Lucca (Zoom), Elizabeth (Zoom), Jay Paradis (Zoom) *please see attached sign-in sheet.*

Note: Minutes are not taken verbatim, please see video.

Pursuant to Chapter 20 of the Acts of 2021, "An Act Relative to Extending Certain COVID-19 Measures Adopted During the State of Emergency", extended by the Governor on March 30, 2023, which extended permission for boards and commissions to conduct remote meetings, the Planning Board conducted this meeting in a hybrid format.

MOTION: Naves makes a motion to open the Planning Board meeting for Tuesday, April 18, 2023, at 7:00 PM. Naves seconds the motion. A roll call vote was taken: Stokes III, aye. Ligols, aye. Naves, aye. Sorenson, aye. Unanimous in favor.

PUBLIC HEARING – NEW

301 Main Street: The Groveland Planning Board will hold a Public Hearing on Tuesday April 18, 2023, beginning at 7:00 PM at 183 Main Street, Groveland MA, to hear the petition on remand as order by the Court on March 15, 2023 of Robert Williams, 180A Main St, Groveland MA 01834, requesting a Site Plan Review and Special Permit per Chapter 40A, Section 6 of the Massachusetts Zoning Act and Chapter 50, Section 13.1 (Site Plan Review) and Section 9.1 (Parking Requirements) of the Groveland Zoning Bylaws. The Court has ordered that the Board reconsider the application and make appropriate findings relative to their decision regarding the Site Plan Review and Special Permit determination dated August 17, 2021, for the redevelopment of the premises as a small retail shop/showroom, as well as a reduction in parking for the business. The property is located at 301 Main Street, Assessors Map 10, Lot 001 and is within the Business Zoning District. The property is owned by the Zong Yang, 10 Bluejay Rd, Lynnfield, MA 01940. The supporting materials are on file in the Economic Development, Planning, & Conservation Department at the Town Hall, and may be viewed during the hours of, Monday through

Thursday 8AM to 3PM, or by contacting Annie Schindler at 978.556.7214 or aschindler@grovelandma.com.

Ligols: Reads into record the above notice. On that decision we are going to bring in Town Counsel, Lisa Mead.

Mead: As you know the court remanded the application back to the Board for two considerations, one because there was a claim by the applicant that the Board was arbitrary and capricious because the board has previously approve a permit for a restaurant not two years prior to when they denied this special permit. The other was that the administrative record contained sparse facts to support the determination that there was a safety issue regarding the use. The court first asks the Board to differentiate the prior application for a restaurant and the current one for the office. The second, to make specific findings in regards to the criteria set forth with the Bylaw and MGL Chapter 40A Section 9. Generally, the applicant makes the presentation again and the Board would have a discussion, ask questions, allow for public comment, and have a discussion surrounding the criteria in Section 50-9.4 which are the requirements for approval in for reduction in parking. Chapter 40 Section 9 requires that you also decide to make the determination based on the health, safety, and welfare of the Town.

Williams: My name is Bob Williams, and I am the applicant for 301 Main St. We are asking for a special permit to revitalize at the old 301 Main St gas station. We will use it as our business office. We are only in and out of the office a couple times a day, early in the morning and late in the afternoon. 11 AM seems to be the peak in that area. We are asking for a reduction because it's so tight down there and we won't be in there much. You have seen a set of plans that shows the improvements we would make to the interior of the building. We will have client meetings in the conference room, make it ADA accessible through a new egress door in and out of the building, update safety lighting, and update the bathroom to be ADA compliant as well. The area outside of the conference room would be used for general storage of equipment, were talking things like buckets of nails, drywall, screws, duct work, some lumber, we have another location we use for most of that stuff. We don't want too much lumber near the computers as the sawdust harms them. The general idea is to update the building, get it cleaned up, and update the area around it to be able to have office space.

Mead: You submitted a document from April 18, 2021 to the Town and advised the Town that you wanted to use the same document, is that correct?

Williams: Yes.

Mead: So, all that information is still accurate? Such as the hours of operation for the office are 8 AM -5 PM to the public, because your operations are performed out in the field reduce the access which is limited to early mornings and late afternoons Monday – Friday 6 AM – 8 AM and 4 PM – 6 PM for employees to pick up or drop off before heading to jobs sites and pick up materials.

Williams: That is correct, and please note that all the meetings would be by appointment only and that the hours of operation would be mainly for the staff, rather than the public. Most of our work is offsite and most times the meetings take place at the client's homes.

Don Greaney, 2 Mill St Etx: The problem I see with that property is that they don't have access to the site. I don't know if that's an issue for you people at this meeting. I know I mentioned it at a Zoning meeting. I spoke with someone at MassDOT District 4, he said that because of the taking that was done by MassDOT for the bridge that due to the taking that was done when the bridge was done, they basically lost access to the property. I don't know if he's wasting his time by carrying on, I don't like to see people lose money or time. I just don't know how you could grant something for a property they can't use. I'm also worried what will happen if they deem the site inaccessible, will it mean the Post Office would also be inaccessible.

Ligols: I think that's why we're here tonight. Anyone else?

Brian Connell, 291, 293 Main St (via Zoom): I wrote a letter to the Town Planner that I would like to be read into the record. I am a direct abutter to the property.

Ligols: Reads letter into record, letter is copied below.

"Dear Town of Groveland Planning Board,

I am writing in regard to the most recently proposed project at 301 Main Street, unfortunately I cannot be in attendance and would like to provide this as my feedback for the public hearing.

On behalf of Groveland Square LLC (owner of 291 and 293 Main Street) and Norwood Insurance (occupant of 293 Main Street) we are in opposition to any project that allows for the former Getty Gas Station at 301 Main Street to be occupied as it shares the same ingress/egress of 299 Main Street which is occupied by the United States Post Office, which at it's best is very limited access and at it's worst a dangerous driveway.

As I've mentioned in past proposals, this site was taken by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for \$618K of tax payer money to decommission the building in it's entirety and in the Appraisal that valued this land taking it states as follows;

"After the taking, the only one allowed to access either one of these properties (gas station or Post Office) will be the postal workers. Eventually at the termination of the Postal Service use, the access to these parcels will be totally restricted, thereby making the remainder of the land the equivalent of a land locked parcel."

I know that in practice this was never enforced as customers continue to use this ingress/egress to enter the Post Office, but the intent of the state's view of this access is clear that this would not be used by those customers and much less for another business entity to reconstitute the property of the gas station which is why our state tax payers money paid the prior owner due to rendering the property a land locked/severely limited parcel.

Also, if this is deemed either a special permit, I would cite the Groveland Zoning By-Laws Section 14.6.1 (b) Special Permits Criteria;

Special permits shall be granted...that the adverse effects of the proposed use will not outweigh its beneficial impacts to the town or the neighborhood...the determination shall include consideration of each of the following; b) Traffic flow and safety, including parking and loading.

With all due respect to the business applying, I do not see how this business' benefit will outweigh the potential Traffic flow, safety, and parking in an already stressed property, dangerous intersection and a square that already has extremely limited parking today with many vacancies, this will only get worse as some of these businesses return to Elm Square, as such we are opposed as the direct abutter to the property.

Lastly, I have sampled many quotes from the local Groveland Facebook page complaining about the safety of the

intersection, ingress/egress and general poor condition of the property:

☐ Parking has always been an issue and getting back on street even worse. I go to Georgetown, W. Newbury and I love Plaistow. - DB

☐ I don't use that PO unless have to. So many others nearby with normal parking - JP

☐ We use West newbury. That parking is treacherous - JS

☐ I do not use it often but when I have been parking across the street the parking lot is a hazard. - LM

☐ Also I dont think I have ever seen the grass (weeds) mowed. It gets so tall and there isn't much to tend to. Not

that it has to be the best looking building on the street but mildly respectable would do. - SM

☐ I no longer go there. Too dangerous to get in and out. John used to mow that grass. No one noticed until he was

no longer there - LL

☐ there's going to be a huge accident there at some point - LJ

☐ They really should just close that branch. - SS

☐ general upkeep of property is disgraceful, and absolutely ridiculous! Whether or not someone uses our post office

or not, it is an eyesore - KA

☐ The parking lot is a disgrace and none of the spots are marked. Take a look at Byfield for a great example of nice rural post office well maintained. Groveland is a perfect example of a building and parking lot that should be condemned. - SG

This sampling of comments above are with ONLY the Post Office, I think it would only get worse adding any additional

business even with minimal foot or vehicle traffic to this site.

Thank you for your time and sorry we could not attend in person, should you have any questions feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Brian Connell

Brian J Connell

Norwood Insurance Agency

office: 978-372-5921 | mobile 617-733-5272

www.norwoodinsurance.com

Please be advised that coverage can not be changed, bound or altered via this email."

Williams: With all due respect Mr. Connell has ulterior motives, if the parking lot has access through his property, the only one who gains is him at everyone else's expense. It is easy to cherry pick from Facebook. I could've brought in the 87 people who responded that thought it was a positive idea to do this. We aren't here about that. What we're here about is to get approval for a special permit to utilize the property according to the Zoning Bylaws, the question of access belongs to the DOT, and I don't want to see us overstepping and getting into jurisdiction that doesn't apply. If you approve this, we still have to go to the DOT and the DOT has final say on whether we can access that. As far as the safety of that lot, when I checked with the Police Department (PD) there have been about 7 incidents over the last three years that have been reported to PD, most of them were not directly involving the Post Office. One was a fight in the parking lot, a couple were for people to exchange papers after they've had an accident in the street at the lights, and a couple of others were from people who rear ended each other at the lights. The one that involved the Post Office directly was a bicyclist that was coming across the bridge and ran into a car who was pulling into the Post Office. So as far as safety goes and the parking lot or the egress and exiting of the parking lot, have never been involved in any of those accidents. So, if we're looking at the safety factor, and I understand that if there were a safety factor, I would adamantly say that there needs to be corrections in order to do anything there. As it stands now if two more vehicles came into the Post Office and left the Post Office, nobody would even know what the count was. UPS and the State use that parking lot and that gas station area as their staging area to access the bridge to open and close it. And everybody turns a blind eye to that. So, all I'm asking is for an opportunity to clean up what is an eyesore to make it a better and cleaner environment and take a building that has got some life left in it, and put it to good use. I'm not asking for anything that isn't within the range of the Board to approve so that we can go to DOT and I'll stand by what the DOT has to say.

Connell: I'd like to refute that; we have birds eye view of that area. Also, not every accident gets reported to Groveland PD. As far as access to the parking lot, we still see people coming into our lot to access this lot and block our access. We just went through three years with the current owner of the parcel who is trying to take over our property and property rights and we were successful. I get that they want to use the property, but it was bought and paid for over 10 years ago to the prior owner. WE are still standing in opposition; we are not cherry picking those are actual quotes from actual people. I recognize that it's not a great situation but adding any other business back would make matters worse. And I'll leave with that, thank you.

Ligols: If that's it from the public we'll move on to Board discussion.

Naves: I don't see a significant safety risk to the public based on the business and the proper plans being implemented. If you think about it the Post Office creates a lot of traffic around Christmas and we don't see an increase in accidents. Additionally, it will slow people down, and keep people in the downtown area, probably reducing accidents as well.

Ligols: Do we have an updated traffic study for this site?

Williams: I do not have an updated traffic study, we have not had need for a traffic study because DOT has jurisdiction over the traffic

Ligols: Mass Greenbook would play into this.

Williams: I have the original traffic study that we submitted before.

Ligols: We'll probably need an updated one.

Williams: I would ask that as a condition of the approval process.

Stokes III: Putting traffic aside, how do we make a decision and approve use of a property that doesn't seem to have access at all. So what is our jurisdiction there. If we had someone else come in, this is a complicated site, generally how do we handle that when someone wants to use a site for that it doesn't have access through it.

Ligols: Most of our sites are accessible, they have to come into here, access is one of the primary sources of planning, and so because of the decision of the court, I don't think we can act in the interest of access but we have to act on safety and health so the question is; there's a loading dock that's in use for the Post Office already, there's limited space in that parking area, there's going to be loading of lumber materials, board, wood, Jackson wood or whatever, any other vehicle coming in, box trucks, fork trucks, we have a parking reg that I believe with this parcels is going to be 19 spaces require, so I don't think we need to look at the access part of this, I think it's already been constructed in the court.

Mead: I can address that. It's a layered issue, so this Boards approval or disapproval is just one aspect of it. It doesn't mean he would have access to the site because he still needs DOT approval. So if you were doing a subdivision approval, but it was also subject to ConCom approval. You may get subdivision approval, but ConCom could never approve the building of the road.

Williams: I will also note that you set a precedent by approved access for the restaurant with more traffic and new deliveries.

Mead: They didn't approve access, in this case. That is a DOT approval. And the special permit before the Bard today is a reduction of parking and that is the criteria, one in section 50-14.6 and one in 50-9.4 and that is supposed to be applied. So if you look at 50-9.4 the finding is whether or not the reduction is inconsistent with public health and safety, or that the reduction promotes a public benefit, and then there are examples under that of how that might be accomplished. Such as common parking lot, having peak demands at different times, ages or other characteristics of those using the facility, peculiarities that make the demand invalid, availability of on street parking or lot near by or municipally owned facilities. In addition you need to look at 50-14.6, the general special permit criteria which discusses whether or not the application addresses social economic needs, traffic flow and safety including parking and loading, adequacy of utilities, neighborhood characteristics, impacts on natural environment, potential fiscal impact, and consistency with the Groveland Community development plan. So the Board, in order to approve the special permit you would need to make positive findings for each of those criteria. If any one of the criteria does not receive a positive finding, then it would be a reason for denial. So the discussion that you're having right now is appropriate because you have to make those findings, the conflict with the loading dock and what's happening, what time people are accessing the site versus other uses on the same parking lot, how does that compare to the restaurant proposal which you did approve.

Ligols: So, the restaurant had different peak hours. The restaurant hours were Tuesday – Thursday 3 PM - 10 PM Friday Saturday Sunday 12 PM -10 PM. During the operational hours, except for ones that overlapped with the post office to limit vehicle circulation on the site first shift employees Monday – Friday would walk from the municipal lot of School St, so it was not the exact same use.

Williams: I'm saying I'll have max two vehicles for If I have an administrative assistant, that may be a vehicle and myself and it's more of a clerical area. As far as loading docks we have space under the canopy and away from the parking that is designated, that is on the parking plans that have been submitted to offload anything we might need. The restaurant would've also had deliveries that would have needed to come in when the vendors showed up. I don't have most of my materials delivered to this office, this would be a place to look at plans, paint colors, tile, etc. We're looking at a clerical situation here. The type of use would be minimal, but I need a place to bring people to show plans etc. I want to make this a landmark that is identifiable to people.

Stokes III: No delivery vehicles other than your own?

Williams: Correct.

Ligols: But you said that at the beginning you would be storing stuff like sheetrock and lumber in the warehouse area.

Williams: No, a large portion of the building is dedicated to office space and conference rooms.

Ligols: There is a loading dock there that will interfere with parking. Even if it is not part of your building, it is still part of the site (*loading dock is attached to the Post Office*). Our criteria is 19 spaces for that site, so there will be interference of health and safety concerns for that site. So as a Board we're just trying to run down the special permit part of this.

Williams: I can understand the concern, but you have to look at historical information to see if there is an impact to the loading dock and see what the impact is.

Ligols: So if we look at it as a layered process this is the criteria we have.

Naves: I'm inclined to think the loading dock may not cause a problem. The deliveries for this building wouldn't be near the loading dock. Also, from the description it doesn't sound like there will be much storage. Based on the business and employees and number of people entering the site, I think we have an ability to waive the 19 parking spaces in my view. I also think it will help to refresh downtown. I think it is a big improvement to the community because the longer it sits the worse the building is going to get.

Stokes III: Can you restate your peak hours that you expect.

Williams: My peak hours and office hours will be very different. We are a construction company. Most of our work hours are from 8 AM to 4:30 PM Mon-Fri most of that work is off site.

Stokes III: What about this site though.

Williams: It would be me going in to use my computer to run an estimate, call my insurance agent, my marketing people, my vendors and so forth to secure pricing, do meetings with architects or designers about product lines that they may carry, and to do client meetings to show them the stuff that we can do for them.

Greaney: If you guys change the required parking spaces for commercial buildings, I understand there are only so many parking spaces per sqft, if you grant this you're going to have so many business with no places to park in the rest of the square.

Ligols: I just can't get by that you have a 30x50 warehouse that you're not going to use.

Williams: This will be a truck restocking place. We order a 50 lb case of nails and we'll refill the trucks as needed. We'll store tools that aren't being used on site. I don't want to do any wood working because of the computers.

Ligols: But it says workspace.

Williams: I want to be able to fix screw guns etc here.

Ligols: Naves I understand what you're saying but I just can't get by the loading. You still have to get within the site.

Naves: Most of that is going to happen in front of the building, not on the side of the building where the loading is near the Post Office.

Sorenson: Just keep in mind that we wrote the special permit keeping in mind the downtown and the limited amount of spaces existing here. We do have a structure that was supposed to be demolished, and it's not a concern of the Planning Board, but it is still something that needs to be kept in mind. We know the site, it's busy, we must adhere to the regulations for this site and every site. I don't think the peak times have a bearing here. I think the regulations should fly.

Naves: I know that if we uphold that we need to look at the restaurant decision.

Stokes III: They were able to meet that by saying they would use the municipal lot.

Mead: I want to make sure that you make it very clear the difference between the two decision of the restaurant and this application.

Ligols: The hours were completely different.

Naves: The Post Office uses box trucks now and it isn't an issue.

Ligols: Is this a unanimous decision?

Planner: It would have to pass with an affirmative vote of 4 members. Also the Post Office hours are Mon-Fri 8:30 AM – 1 PM, then 2 PM – 5 PM. Sat 8:30 am – 12 PM. *Reads Brian Connell's comment*

from Zoom: "I'm not sure if anyone has brought up the benefit of the town to have a new restaurant, but what is the benefit to the town to have a single office for a builder, that office could go anywhere."

Mead: I want to make it clear the Board has a special provision to allow for reduced parking, so that's what they're discussing, and there are certain criteria to allow for that, which is what they're asking to.

Sorenson: I want to stick with the parking regulations. We haven't seen a new parking stuffy and it is a very busy road. The Town had looked at turning this whole site into a parking lot. That is why this regulation was put in place and not scrambling to find parking in other areas. We've been looking to do downtown revitalization here for years, and use this spot for parking.

Stokes: For the sake of argument we want fewer cars going in and out of there, so if there are less spots it will mean there are less cars going in and out.

Sorenson: Less spots means more back up in the street so that traffic backs up on the street.

Kathy Chadwick, Alyssa Dr: There was a rumor years ago that the Post Office was going to move and with more development in town the post office is just going to get busier. Is the Post Office here forever or is it going to move?

Greaney: A lot across the street (*across the street from Town Hall*) there is a lot that the owner was going to build and move into but it was never built.

Ligols: That is not a question we are able to answer on this Board. What if we take a vote now and all four of us are not on the same page?

Mead: It would fail and the special permit would be denied. We have to get it back to the court by May 14th, so maybe before the next meeting I can draft up a decision based on what I've heard so far. You can have it fail, we just need to make sure the decision would hold up in court.

MOTION: Sorenson make a motion to continue the public hearing on the 301 Main Street Remand to the May 2nd meeting at 7 PM at Groveland Town Hall. Stokes III seconds the motion A roll call vote was taken: Stokes III, aye. Ligols, aye. Naves, aye. Sorenson, aye. Unanimous in favor.

Naves: Bob how many employees do you have?

Williams: 6 on the payroll, we outsource HR and marketing, we also have subs. We park out two trucks in Haverhill. My employees show up to the warehouse.

Ligols: I think we're going to jump to the Form A lot.

52 Seven Star Road: *Continued.* ANR Lot/Form A.

Holt: Here for the owners of 52 Seven Star Rd. We were here previously, and we had a couple revisions to make. Both lots are in excess of 30,000 sqft. We added the second driveway for the lot directly adjacent to 52 Seven Star Rd. We also removed the shed that was on the lot that will be created that will have frontage on Wood St.

MOTION: Ligols motions to endorse the Form A Application and plans for 52 Seven Star Rd. Stokes III seconds. A roll call vote was taken; Stokes III, aye. Ligols, aye. Naves, aye. Sorenson, aye. Unanimous in favor.

PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION FILING - CONTINUED

181R School Street: In accordance with MGL Chapter 41 Section 81S and the Town of Groveland Subdivision Rules & Regulations, will hold a public meeting on Tuesday March 21, 2023 which will begin at 7 PM at the Groveland Town Hall, 183 Main St, Groveland, MA 01834 to hear the application of Minco Development Corp, 231 Sutton St, Suite 1B, North Andover, MA, requesting approval of a seven lot Preliminary Subdivision Plan labeled "Preliminary Subdivision for a street to be named at 181R School Street Groveland, Massachusetts". The site is located in the Residential 2 Zoning District (Assessors Map 34, Lot 13).

Ligols: *Reads above.*

Schkuta: This is a preliminary plan for discussion purposes. The first waiver was for the curbing, by regulation the Town requires vertical granite curbing, for cost, the houses will cost more if we use this, as well as because granite is hard to get. The other is for the K-value, we're looking to be compliant with the

AASHTO so the curvature of the road. The third is to allow for 300 ft rather than 400 ft. So at this time we're asking for a positive determination regarding the preliminary plan to move on to the next step.

Sorenson: As I mentioned before I think this plan was a perfect conceptual plan, also we don't have our peer review. This filing is insufficient, the waivers are not relevant at this time. The curbing we will need to be maintained by the town.

Stokes: I agree with the comment of the curbing. K value?

Schkuta: That's correct, the state standards are different than your regulations, we want to match the state. The third was the reduction between the existing roadways because it will match existing roads surrounding it. So, this is a preliminary plan for discussion purposes in the bylaw. We will incorporate all existing comments in the definitive plan. This site has not been engineered fully for the definitive plan. We will work with the boards and other departments and all their regulations will be met.

Greaney: It doesn't look like there's any place to put snow at the end. Because with Whitestone they did get some waivers. But none of the residents there get trash services or snow removal.

Schkuta: I get the concern with rat tail lots, but these meet all the zoning bylaws.

Sorenson: I think this whole plan defies the spirit and intent of the bylaws. It's not even engineered and is missing quite a few things. It would've given the applicant more information and to send it out for peer review engineering as well.

Maniscalco: What is different from the last one?

Schkuta: Nothing.

Resident: My lot is in the corner there and I'm really concerned about the runoff.

Ligols: If they file a definitive plan the stormwater will get reviewed and will have to comply with the state.

MOTION: Sorenson motions to deny the Preliminary application for 181R School St based upon input from the citizens, board, regulations and the spirit and intent of the Zoning Bylaws. A roll call vote was taken; Stokes III, aye. Ligols, aye. Naves, aye. Sorenson, aye. Unanimous in favor.

142 King Street: Discussion of as-built and bond release.

Connors: I own 142 King St, driveway is in, erosion controls are in, is there a way around an outside review? It's per plan, you can walk it with me.

Ligols: An as built is always peer reviewed. It's always reviewed by a peer reviewer for this Board.

Connors: It's a driveway at the end of the day, not a full scale road.

Ligols: With stormwater drainage.

Sorenson: This is a single lot subdivision that went through an entire process, this is part of that process. It may look like a driveway to the average person but it's a right of way, but it's pretty clear and it's required. It went through the process.

Connors: Annie can you help me get this going?

Planner: Yes I will reach out to TEC

UPDATES & DISCUSSION

Signatures: Signatures for the Registry of Deeds

Planner: I have received all signatures, thank you.

MEETING MINUTES: Approval of March 21 and April 4, 2023, meeting minutes.

MOTION: Sorenson motions to accept the March 21 and April 4, 2023, meeting minutes. Ligols seconds the motion. A roll call vote was taken: Stokes III, aye. Ligols, aye. Naves, aye. Sorenson, aye. Unanimous in favor.

TOWN PLANNER UPDATE

Planner: I just want to remind the Board and the public that Town Meeting is April 24th, 2023, at the Bagnall Elementary School starting at 7 PM. We do have a couple of Zoning changes on the warrant so please try to be present.

OTHER ITEMS NOT REASONABLE ANTICIPATED AT TIME OF POSTING

None.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Sorenson motions to adjourn the meeting at 8:37 PM. Stokes seconds the motion. A roll call vote was taken: Stokes III, aye. Ligols, aye. Naves, aye. Sorenson, aye. Unanimous in favor.