City of Westfield

PLANNING BOARD

Philip McEwan
Peter Fiordalice, Vice Chair
William Carellas
Cheryl Crowe
Robert Goyette
Jane Magarian
Carl Vincent
Raymond St. Hilaire, Associate

June 21, 2016

Chairman McEwan called the regular meeting of the Westfield Planning Board to order at 7:00 pm in the City Council Chambers, 59 Court Street, Westfield, MA.

	PB MEMBERS PRESENT		**STAFF**
	MEMBERS ABSENT		
X	Philip McEwan, Chair	X	Jay Vinskey, Principal Planner
X	Peter Fiordalice, Vice Chair	X	Christine Fedora, Secretary
X	William Carellas		
	Robert Goyette		
X	Jane Magarian		
X	Carl Vincent		
X	Cheryl Crowe		
X	Raymond St. Hilaire (Associate)		

A. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Chairman McEwan asked if there was anyone in the room who would like to address the Board during the public participation portion of the meeting regarding items not currently before the Board?

There being no one heard the Board proceeded to their next item on the agenda.

B. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

Fiordalice MOTIONED, seconded by Carellas to approve the 6-7-16 minutes. Vincent abstained as he was not at the 6-7-16 meeting. Seven (6) in favor, one (1) abstention.

C. Review of "Approval Not Required" Plans

Chair McEwan turned the Chair to Vice Chair Fiordalice to conduct ANR's.

- 177 Whitaker Road ~Coach/Premny ~ Conveyance

Magarian MOTIONED, seconded by Crowe to approve the ANR. The Board voted unanimously to approve the ANR plan as submitted.

- 45 Miller Street ~John & Sandra Wood

Carellas MOTIONED, seconded by Magarian to approve the ANR. The Board voted unanimously to approve the ANR plan as submitted.

- 65,69,77 Old Stage Road ~ Dorothy Saalfrank

APPROVED

Carellas MOTIONED, seconded by Crowe to approve the ANR. The Board voted unanimously to approve the ANR plan as submitted.

D. Posted Public Hearings *(and possible decision)*

- Continuation – Special Permit/Site Plan – Motor vehicles service – 402-410 Southampton Road.

Correspondence from Attorney Brad Moir requested a continuance. Fiordalice MOTIONED, seconded by Magarian to allow the continuance to July 19. All in Favor.

- Continuation – Special Permit – Open Space Community (1 flag lot) – East Mountain Road.

McEwan read correspondence from Mr. Capua requesting withdrawal of his application without prejudice. Fiordalice MOTIONED, seconded by St. Hilaire to allow the application to be withdrawn without prejudice. Motion passes. AIF.

- Zoning Map Amendment – 0 & 86 Medeiros Way (Parcels 70R-17 & 26) – from Business B to Industrial A

Chair McEwan read the notice into the record for 86 Medeiros Way requesting a zone change from Business B to Industrial A.

Representing the petitioner was Rob Levesque of R. Levesque and Associates. Mr. Levesque explained the owner of the property currently has a regional site contracting business at the location and would like to expand. The adjacent areas are owned by the petitioner and zoned Industrial A so this would be contiguous with the rest of the property. The current use is an allowed use and would be allowed in IA, noting anything in IA would be subject to Special Permit.

Vincent inquired how this is tied to the property that is currently before the Council? Levesque inquired if the location he was speaking of was on Medeiros way? Vincent replied yes. Mr. Levesque informed him that it is contractors yard in front of council,. not a zone change request. Mr. Levesque explained to the Board the contractor's yard that is currently before the Council is owned by another person, they are seeking a permit for Western MA Demo. Vincent also asked if this is in the aquifer? Levesque informed him they are staying out of the aquifer noting it was previously on the endangered species map but has been lifted.

Room fact?

In favor?

Opposed?

Questions board?

Vinskey noted contractors yards are allowed in both districts, noting the Board should be considering the IA uses which are more intensive.

APPROVED

Fiordalice inquired as to the location of the IA properties? Mr. Levesque proceeded to show the current property as zoned as well as the property that is being proposed to be changed noting this would make the property contiguous.

Carellas inquired what the benefit would be if it's already an allowed use? Levesque informed him they would like to bring recycled material to the site which would require a special permit. Vinskey noted recycling construction material would be a City Council special permit. Magarian asked if it is not allowed in Business B? Correct.

Vincent felt there has been a lot of movement from one zone to another, he felt it is abolishing certain areas certain zoning. He voiced his concerns the zoning is being changed parcel by parcel, as well as voicing his concerns towards the people who live in these zones.

Levesque felt the subject properties are the only one his client controls it's a viable use now on one of the properties. He would like to use the property adjacent to him, noting it's a growing business in Westfield.

As far as abutters, Levesque stated the abutters were notified, have not heard anything against this. He also felt they if there were issues they could be addressed during the special permit process. Vinskey noted the abutters do not get notified in zone changes. McEwan inquired if the IA is a higher use then BB? Vinskey informed him the IA generally allows more noxious uses than BB.

Fiordalice MOTIONED, seconded by Magarian to close the hearing.

Discussion?

Vincent opposed to closing. Vincent would like to see a paper example of the proposed changes. Levesque presented Vincent with the information he was looking for. Vincent withdrew his opposition to closing.

Magarian MOTIONED, seconded by St. Hilaire to send a positive recommendation to change from the zoning BB to IA.

Discussion?

Phil McEwan	-	yes
Peter Fiordalice	-	yes
Bill Carellas	-	yes
Robert Goyette	-	not present
Jane Magarian	-	yes
Carl Vincent	-	no
Cheryl Crowe	-	yes
Raymond St. Hilaire	-	yes

Six (6) in favor, One (1) opposed (Vincent opposed) to send a positive recommendation.

- Special Permit – Conversion to two families – 7 Grand St.

The Westfield Planning Board will conduct Public Hearings on June 21, 2016, at 7:00 PM, in City Council Chambers, Municipal Building, 59 Court Street, Westfield, MA on the applications of:

APPROVED

Elzbietta Chmiel for a Special Permit per Section 3-60.4(1) of the Zoning Ordinance, to allow for the conversion of a single family structure to 2 dwelling units. Subject property is 7 Grand St., zoned Residence B.

McEwan called on the petitioner/representative to present the proposal.

Jason Chmiel
Presenting the proposal to the Board was Jason Chmiel, husband to Elzbietta. The petitioner would like to allow the conversion of a 1 family to a 2 family house . He would like to have his son live, there would be separate utilities, entrance. Currenty they live in Agawam in a single family home and it is not working out for them. He noted there currently are 5 or 6 multi family homes on the street and they would like to be able to convert this home to a 2 famly as well.

Vincent asked if there would be parking? Would there be ample parking? Chmie replied it has double lots, it used to be 2 lots but because of zoning change the second lot can't be built on.

Magarian asked how big the house is s.f.? 1000 upstairs and downstairs.

Fiordlace asked if there was an entry for second floor apartment? House was built like 2 apartment house, main entrance one flight goes upstairs and one downstairs, the second set of stairs go to second floor and in the middle of building is second exit from kitchen on the first floor, a lot of entrances and doors, there are 2 separate entrances for each apartment.

Phil entrances inside or outside? Staircase inside houses and entry way. Chmiel replied there are stairs inside of house, no stairs outside house.

Public questions?

In favor?

Opposition?

Questions?

Vincent asked if he was aware of the planners suggestion for a tree? Vinskey replied no, adding it's a condition the Board has been applying to infill but this technically is not an infill application. Fiordalice felt it's consistent with neighborhood, a lot of multifamily homes in the area. Magarian MOTIONED, seconded by Vincent to close the hearing. All in favor.

Findings
After giving due regard to the application, testimony and evidence at the public hearing, the Board found that (1) The specific site is an appropriate location for conversion to a two-family dwelling and is e; (2) The use, site and structure as existing and developed will not adversely affect the surrounding residential neighborhood, similarly developed; (3) Adequate and appropriate facilities, including parking, will be provided for the proper operation of the use; (4) The plan, as approved, conforms to all other rules and regulations.

(5) The project will retain the residential character and style of the structure and is consistent with the density, scale and character of the surrounding residential neighborhood. (4) Further, though not

APPROVED

specifically required under 3-60.4(1), submitted calculations show that the lot's density will be less than the average of those of at least 60% of the lots located within that same Zoning District within a 300 foot radius of the property lines.

DRAFT Conditions

1. To buffer and compensate for the increased density and parking, at least 1 shade tree (2.5" caliper at planting) selected from the Planning Board's tree list shall be installed and maintained in the front yard area (a tree planted in the public street right-of way, with City approval, may satisfy this requirement.)

Additions, conversations?
Vincent noted this is a double lot and asked if it would be possible to have 2 shade trees added?
Vincent MOTIONED, Fiordalice seconded to amend the conditions to 2 trees. AIF.

Carellas MOTIONED, seconded by Magarian to approve the findings and conditions as read and amended.

Raymond St. Hilaire	-	yes
Cheryl Crowe	-	yes
Bill Carellas	-	Yes
Jane Magarian	-	Yes
Peter Fiordalice	-	Yes
Carl Vincent	-	Yes
Philip McEwan	-	Yes

Seven (7) in favor, Zero (0) opposed. MOTION passes.

- Special Permit – Open Space Community (1 flag lot), reduced side yard – 658 & 0 Montgomery Rd. (Parcel 60R-13)

The Westfield Planning Board will conduct Public Hearings on June 21, 2016, at 7:00 PM, in City Council Chambers, Municipal Building, 59 Court Street, Westfield, MA on the applications of:

Susan & Timothy Crane for a Special Permit to create a flag lot for a single family dwelling and reduction in side yard setbacks, pursuant to Sections 5-60 (Open Space Communities) & 3-40.4(13) of the Zoning Ordinance. Subject property is 658 & 0 (Parcel 60R-13) Montgomery Rd., zoned Rural Residential.

Representing the petitioner was Rob Levesque of R. Levesque and Associates.

Levesque stated this is a conceptual open space; the parcel has a number of existing structures on it that the applicant wishes to keep.

Levesque informed the Board they are proposing 2 lots, lot 1 along frontage 1.89 acres, lot 2 in the back which would be about an acre and a half, for a total of 3.39 acres of developable land.

The open space would be 5.26 acres for total site area 8.73 acres, resulting in about 60% open space. The house location has been tested for title IV. they will need to file for access to the driveway with con com and endangered species program as well.

APPROVED

Fiordalice asked if there is anything proposed for lot 1 in front? Levesque informed him there is an existing single family home. Vincent asked if they are requesting to create a lot in front by dividing a lot and create a flag lot? Levesque informed him they're looking to create 2 lots from a parent lot. One will remain with the existing structure on the property and one flag lot that would have the development portion on the west side of the brook. Vincent asked how much land used? 3.39 acres will be developed with 5.26 remaining open space; Levesque thought it was his understanding it would make sense for the Conservation Commission to hold that restriction.

The driveway would be just less than 1000 feet; he then explained the lot configuration to the board as well as showing the open space area. Further discussion regarding the open space area and the configuration of the lots. Vincent asked why they weren't using the front portion of the lot? Levesque informed him there are wetlands as well as structures on the frontage that are rural in nature, nice barns; the applicant would like to keep.

McEwan inquired as to what plan using or modified? Vinskey noted it was the colored plan that was just received today. McEwan noted the ordinance limits the pole to 500 feet, intended to limit the driveway to 500 feet. Vinskey noted technically it complies because the pole would have to be formed by the property line (not the conservation limits), but the Board can consider the intent of limiting driveway length.

Vincent mentioned the flag lot ordinance is still in L & O. Vinskey added it's been in committee for a years; the only way to do a flag lot in Westfield is through the open space provision.
McEwan reiterated his feelings towards the flag lots; he felt the Open Space Ordinance is for a community not for a person.

Vincent voiced concerns regarding trash collection and mail delivery with it being such a long driveway. Levesque informed him they would have to meet all of the requirements of everyone else. McEwan further discussed the Open Space Ordinance he then mentioned some of the open space ordinances that have been approved Scenic Ridge and Hawks Nest. The purpose and intent is not flag lot ordinance.

Carellas agreed with McEwan noting this is the third one in three meetings. He agrees he is seeing more and more of these, he felt it's becoming a perversion. McEwan also felt it's a perversion of the intent of the open space ordinance.

Vinskey noted in the previous application, East Mountain Rd., they were using this ordinance to make an unbuildable lot, buildable- whereas this they have frontage for 2 buildable ANR lots. Vinskey also noted there is 100 adjacent acres the city is currently preserving so that was one of the thoughts behind this growing contiguous area.

Levesque noted the applicant came in 6 months ago and talked planner. Levesque felt this is an opportunity to protect open space, opportunity to protect land, he felt the Board should weigh the benefit; agree this is part of bigger consideration, not just a flag lot, its being done by a family, for a family member. He felt this would maintain the rural character of the Montgomery Road; he's discussed with planner, and has been in touch with abutters. Not looking to pervert. Respectfully request look at other circumstances. Magarian asked if there was a house and barns on the first lot? Yes. Vinskey noted the existing second back lot is sort of already a flag lot.

Questions of fact?

APPROVED

No one.

Kirsten Thompson ~ Wild Flower Circle
Affect taxes that would pay City of Westfield? Reduce taxes? Why would somebody do this?
Jay still building lots.

In support?

Tim Crane and Susan Crane
Owners of property in question. He proceeded to explain the reasoning as to why they would like to do it this way, they informed the Board the houses were built in 1835, the barn that is currently located there it was moved from Montgomery generations ago and they would like to keep it there as it adds to the integrity of the neighborhood, there is also a septic system and leach system in front of the barn, the whole idea of this was to maintain their property and the integrity of the neighborhood.

Letter of support.
Luis and Charlyn Puza
McEwan gave a brief summary of the letter stating they were in favor.

Mr. Crane also went to people on abutters list and explained what they wanted to do.

In support?

Opposed?

Magarian added the structures up there are beautiful, aesthetically pleasing, she felt it's calming and peaceful to have , she felt if the houses were put in the front it would not preserve integrity of roadway scenery.

Crowe said she understands why it's so set back, she goes up and down the road quite frequently, she would like to see the area preserved.

Carellas asked if they would be gifting land to city? Levesque noted the open space would be controlled by the Conservation Commission if they were to accept it. Vinskey noted it would have to stay part of the lot, noting the city would hold a restriction on it.

McEwan read state language into the record regarding what adequate frontage is. Lot reduction by special permit. The Board has to decide whether it meets the Special Permit.

McEwan asked if there was a motion to close or continue?

Carellas MOTIONED, seconded by Fiordalice to continue to the Board's next meeting. McEwan informed members they could find what he read into the record at MA ANR handbook.

McEwan felt if the Board reads the open space from top to bottom he didn't think the Board could come to conclusion that it's being served. McEwan felt this is circumventing the whole thing. Vincent concurred with McEwan.

Vincent asked if they would go to the ZBA prior to coming back to the Board? Vinskey stated there is no need for ZBA -the special permit allows the frontage requirement.

APPROVED

Magarian asked why McEwan didn't think it fits the spirit of the open space? McEwan was there during the passage of the open space ordinance, noting the intent was to create a condensed subdivision, rather than one lot.

Fiordalice read section 5 -60-2 (D) of the open space which states what is required for the open space subdivision as far as the infrastructure goes which basically is for larger communities. Further discussion regarding open space.

All in favor of continuing to July 19.

- Special Permit – Home Based Business – 154 Wildflower Circle

The Westfield Planning Board will conduct Public Hearings on June 21, 2016, at 7:00 PM, in City Council Chambers, Municipal Building, 59 Court Street, Westfield, MA on the applications of:
Maura Bonavita for a Special Permit per Zoning Ord. Sec. 5-100.2 to allow for a home-based esthetics studio business at 154 Wildflower Circle, zoned Residence A.

The applicant Maura Bonavita addressed the Board. She informed the Board she would like to make her in law apartment space into her business at 154 Wildflower Circle. The business would run 2 days a week from 12:00 to 6:00, one client at a time, parking in driveway, no signage and not advertising. The type of business is aesthetic, skin care, waxing, make up. Magarian asked how many clients would she service per day or hour? The majority of her clients would be about an hour long, 5 and 6 a day, she would be the only one working. The Board asked if she would be working weekends? She informed the Board she would be working most likely Wednesday and Friday, occasionally Saturday. Vincent asked this would be in the in law apartment? He also noted the plan did not show the driveway. Ms. Bonavita informed him there is a driveway now. Magarian inquired about product storage? Ms. Bonavita replied it would be stored in side on a couple of shelves.

Fiordalice asked the business will be 2 days a week Wednesday and Friday? What happens if someone comes on Monday? She informed them they need to keep to 2 days a week because of child care. She was thinking occasionally on Saturday morning, adding she has 2 little ones, and another one on the way, the appointments will be staggered. Appointment based only no walk ins, literally one car at a time. Vincent asked what happens in 5 years business picks up want to take on employee? She stated she would not be taking on any employees adding life will be busier as the children get older. Crowe asked if she would be selling the product as well? No selling, no retail by ordinance.

Questions ?

Rob Orszak ~161 Wildflower
Moved in 1995 first time someone looked for some sort of business in our section of very expensive homes. Bonavitas recently moved in want to open business don't know how having business will affect zoning, they said they would have no signage, there is a traffic problem up there, Munger and Wildflower is a dangerous area , there are 4 stop signs and no one pays attention. There are no other businesses there how will this affect their property values? Pay a lot in taxes hate to see value decrease.

McEwan informed him home based businesses are allowed in all zones, allowed by special permit noting the idea is for them to be invisible. McEwan noted they are not allowed by right it has to go through this Special Permit review.

APPROVED

Kirsten Thompson ~ 145 Wildflower
Asked if there are restricted covenants in Westfield? She asked if these covenants were approved when the subdivision was approved? Vinskey informed her the restrictive covenants are not concerns of the City; it's up to the neighbors as to how they govern themselves. McEwan also mentioned there should be a Homeowner's Association. She further asked if the covenants would be part of the deed and approval of the subdivision? Vinskey informed her the city gets involved in items that pertain to the City such as detention basin maintenance, the City does not get involved in the covenants that are put on from by the Association they do not get involved in the minutia. Vincent asked if these covenants get filed at the registry of deeds? Vinskey noted the Planning Board acts on the zoning ordinance. The City does not get involved with disagreements between neighbors that don't violate an ordinance. Magarian asked if this could be something the Board could consider? Vinskey informed her you can consider anything but you have to base the decision on the ordinance.

McEwan agreed with Vinskey noting this is a civil matter the Board has no jurisdiction over.

Questions of fact?

Barbara Rokosz

Asked if the applicant practices now? Yes. Rokosz questioned if an in law apartment could be used for a business? McEwan no problem with eliminating an apartment.

Who would enforce this? The Building Inspector within building department but it was noted they generally do not do drive-by patrols; you would have to file a complaint.

Kirsten Thompson letter.

From: K T
To: j.vinskey@cityofwestfield.org
Cc: K. T.
Subject: Special Permit- Maura Bonavita
Date: Thursday, June 16, 2016 3:47:07 PM
Jay, per our telephone conversation, I wanted to touch base with you. I have a schedule conflict for June 21 and in the event I cannot make the hearing in person I wanted to relay my concerns to you.
First, I would like to point out that Noble Estates, the development in question was established as a residential neighborhood with restrictive covenants. As you know the purpose of the covenants is to maintain a pleasant and agreeable neighborhood setting whereas property values are maintained based on the esthetics and residential nature of the neighborhood. Rule 2 of these covenants provides that "no noxious or offensive trade or activity shall be carried on upon said lot, nor shall anything be done thereon, which may be or become an annoyance or nuisance to the neighborhood and no part of said lots shall be used for storage purposes."

Rule 3 prohibits any sign displayed to the public.

I oppose the granting of this special permit under the guise that this subdivision as outlined in the restrictive covenant was established as a residential neighborhood. Having a home based business which would generate any additional traffic to the neighborhood is both an annoyance and a safety concern as the house in questions is located at the corner of Munger Hill and Wildflower Circle where there are many public and private bus stops at that intersection. This intersection has been a problem for the neighbors here since Munger Hill was expanded past Wildflower. Additional cars parked at this intersection will make it difficult for the buses to safely pick up and drop off the children. It will create visibility hazards for the children to safely cross this intersection, where cars do not obey the four way stop that is posted.

My understanding is that if this permit were to be granted with restrictions, it would be the neighbor's responsibility to assure compliance. This is not a position anyone wants to be in at their residence which is supposed to be their sanctuary. While I wish our new neighbors much success in life, I feel businesses belong in business zones, and I do not wish to live in a business zone when I purchased a home in Westfield's premier residential neighborhood at a premium to comparable homes

APPROVED

in other areas. I also wish to preserve our property values and protect our children as much as possible. We have lived in this home for 16 years and hope that the Westfield Planning Board will uphold the residential character of Noble Estates.
Thank you for your consideration,
Kirsten Thompson

Questions of fact?

Ms. Bonavita informed the Board she read the covenant and made sure she is abiding by rules, the house had business before they moved in, hope to make nicer, not affect traffic as far as blocking visibility nothing more than one car at a time.

Carellas asked where she works? Wilbraham. Magarian asked what the purpose of working from home rather business? She would like to be home with her kids, will have to have babysitter now travel an hour and half from work pick up kids from school and closer to them.

In favor?

Opposed?

Someone who grew up in the community. He felt what is being proposed is far less obnoxious than some of the things that are currently happening in the area.

Opposed?

Kirsten Thompson
Reiterated the fact this is a residential neighborhood, it's a bad intersection, kids all over. This is stressing her out. Doesn't want businesses in her neighborhood. This is not the neighborhood to have a business in your home.

Magarian asked about the business prior? Quality ink and toner running there. Know of 2 other businesses in the neighborhood. One is a hair salon, and exercise studio. St. Hilaire noted there was a Special permit for exercise studio. McEwan noted an exercise studio was approved 6 months ago. Kirsten just learned of it, once this is allowed she felt it would open a Pandora 's Box. Really surprised exercise business was allowed. Traffic issue, intersection issue. Very surprised.

Magarian MOTIONED, seconded by Carellas to close the hearing. AIF.

DRAFT Findings
(1) the specific site is an appropriate location for such a home-based business, occurring in an accessory apartment space; (2) The use as developed will not adversely affect the neighborhood given the restrictions established in the ordinance (Section 5-100.2) and the conditions imposed; (3) Adequate and appropriate facilities, including parking, will be available for the proper operation of the use; (4) the plan, as approved, conforms to all other rules and regulations.

DRAFT Conditions

1. Hours of operation shall be limited to between ___am and ___pm, ____ days a week.

APPROVED

2. Not more than ____ clients are permitted on the premises at any one time.

3. This Special Permit is non-transferrable and shall expire upon the sale and/or transfer of ownership of the property (unless the listed Applicant, as principal practitioner, continues reside in the home).

4. The Planning Board, and/or their designee, reserves the right to inspect the premises through the first year of the use of this Special Permit.

5. No associated signage is permitted or was proposed.

Discussion findings? Vincent voiced concerns unique case situation where someone trying to get off the ground and whether business fly or not, seems reverse in business and move part to Westfield, keep overhead down, troubled by that. Section 5-100.1 think looking at from different angle.

Magarian believe she works for somebody else several woman do that, works in Wilbraham, wants to establish a couple days at home. Bonavita they are her clients, don't plan on advertising . Not our business own, coming as employee and branching out on own? Correct.

Bill don't have issue with trying to do with property restrictions, number of in home salesman and G.C.'s who have clients come to their house that is an essence trade our of house, even though location somewhere else people are coming to the house, as long as abide by rules no issues.

McEwan home based businesses there, he felt there are people that collect stamps and aesthetic difference one car in driveway most have more than one driveway out of site, if didn't know they wouldn't know.

Conditions hours of operation? Noon and 6 p.m.'
Wednesday and Friday. One client at a time. No on street parking. Stop at stop sign.
Carl residence concerned drafting conditions non-transferable. Vinskey allow Saturday too? It was agreed the Condition will be for 2 days a week.

6. No on street parking, parking on site.

Carellas MOTIONED, seconded by Vincent to approve the Special Permit with findings and conditions as read and amended.

Raymond St. Hilaire	-	yes
Cheryl Crowe	-	yes
Bill Carellas	-	Yes
Jane Magarian	-	Yes
Peter Fiordalice	-	Yes
Carl Vincent	-	Yes
Philip McEwan	-	Yes

E. Other Business

- (8:00 PM) FAA Noise Program Mitigation relative to zoning and subdivision proposals.

APPROVED

Brian Barnes
Addressed the Board informing them he is presenting the Executive Summary which indicates Noise mitigation program started in 2010. He mentioned he is not asking for anything from the Planning Board at this point but wanted to start the dialogue.

Some of the sections he thought he should highlight for the members were 17 measures which start on page 356, measure LU5, LU6, LU8. Others that would impact the Planning Board would be the modification to subdivision control law, noise mitigation which arts on page 35 to 41.

Vinskey asked the Board if they wanted him to review and come up with some ideas? Yes.

F. Announcements/Future agenda Items

Vinskey informed the Board the Zoning Board of Appeals is petitioning changes to the zoning mostly will be administrative edits including some matters previously discussed with the Planning Board; hearing is anticipated for the July meeting.

MOTION TO adjourn at 9:13. AIF.

APPROVED