



**Halifax Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
March 7, 2019**

**Official**

**A meeting of the Halifax Planning Board was held on Thursday, March 7, 2019, at 6:38 p.m. at the Halifax Town Hall, Meeting Room #1, 499 Plymouth Street, Halifax, Massachusetts.**

**Members Present:** Gordon Andrews, Mark Millias, Karlis Skulte **Absent:** Jonathan Soroko, Larry Belcher

The meeting was called into session at 6:38 p.m. and the agenda was read into the minutes by Gordon Andrews  
Motion to accept the agenda as read

MOTION: Mark Millias

SECOND: Karlis Skulte

AIF

6:35 p.m.

Motion to suspend the regular Planning Board meeting and open the Public Hearing for 139 Hemlock Ln  
File 19-SPR-01.

MOTION: Mark Millias

SECOND: Karlis Skulte

AIF

Public Hearing opened: Present is Mr. Robert Bergstrom

Members went thru the site plan review checklist with Mr. Bergstrom to see what still remained for waivers that need to be requested. There was no new information submitted by the petitioner. Mr. Skulte asked about wetlands. Mr. Bergstrom said that it is all conservancy out beyond the property.

He also asked if there was any lighting that is brought into the site.

Mr. Bergstrom stated that he has a diesel generator with flood lights but is usually done by dark. Lights are not on during the event and it is (6') fenced off per order of the Board of Health. The generator is also used for the PA system. Dumpster is also in that area (He drew it on the plan). Most items do not apply to this type of project, more for informational purposes.

Mr. Andrews asked Mr. Bergstrom to sign the checklist. "Now what your asking for waivers, versus what you asked for" Mr. Skulte explained that they have added to the (new) plan some of the required items so they don't need those waivers any longer. Mr. Andrews stated that the board is reluctant to grant a waiver for everything, because it sets a precedent. Basically you asked for a waiver of everything, but have supplied a plan that now satisfies 90%, so only need some waivers. So will ask for them individually, as now don't need as many.

There will be temporary signage for directions "in and out", nothing permanent. Have a parking crew to park cars. Mr. Bergstrom also noted that he will have a parking crew to direct cars. ADA was also noted.

Mr. Skulte stated there is still no stamp or signature of engineer, that will need to be waived. Mr. Bergstrom agreed to the updated waiver request, signed and dated, the bottom of the checklist in agreement with the waivers that are now required. Waivers were noted and the list of required waivers were read into record by Karlis Skulte.

1. Information relating to proposed parking areas and signs
2. All proposed structures including: their area and dimensions, (no dimensions on the plan) their exact location, (the location fluctuates based on vegetation site conditions, which is a general representation of

- it) their relation to topography, (there is no topography shown on the plan) and their proposed use, (there is no proposed use)
- 3. Existing and proposed drainage as it relates to a number of issues, (since there is no changes to the site and proposed condition, everything is temporary, that is not impacted.
- 4. Site Plan drawn at 1"=20' or for larger lots 1"=40', (this type of project it is more applicable 1'=100' scale is shown)
- 5. General soil type; no information of soil type, again, there's no permanent change to the site.
- 6. General characteristics of property within 300', including structures and their uses, parking areas, driveways, pedestrian ways and zoning districts.
- 7. Existing and Proposed topography at 2' contours including any outcropping of bedrock
- 8. Final contours and measures and structures to minimize erosion and siltation during construction.
- 9. Name and stamps of the responsible registered land surveyor, landscape architect or civil engineer.

Motion to approve the site plan submitted under Site Plan Review 19-SPR-01 for Mud Fest, 139 Hemlock Lane With the waivers just listed.

The Planning Board also grants this petition with the following conditions

- 1. Hemlock Ln be completely swept after each event, requested by the Highway Surveyor, the petitioner agreed to put down wood chips and also clean any remaining mud, dirt, and debris (per Mr. Bergstrom)
- 2. The Zoning Board of Appeals Special Permit decision letter be recorded with the Plymouth Registry of Deeds and proof of recording submitted for town records.
- 3. All conditions associated with the Special Permit and all previous conditions recommended by the Board of Selectman be incorporated.

MOTION: Karlis Skulte

SECOND: Mark Millias

All in favor

Motion to close the Public Hearing for Mud Fest return to the regularly scheduled Planning Board Meeting

MOTION: Mark Millias

SECOND: Karlis Skulte

All in favor

6:40 p.m.

Motion to suspend the regular Planning Board Meeting and open the Public Hearing for Site Plan Review 19-SPR-03 at 330 Plymouth St. for O'Reilly

MOTION: Mark Millias

SECOND: Karlis Skulte

All in Favor

**Notice is hereby given that a public hearing will be held by the Halifax Planning Board on Thursday, March 7, 2019 at 6:40 p.m. in Meeting Room #1, second floor of the Halifax Town Hall, 499 Plymouth Street, Halifax, MA on the site plan application submitted on February 7, 2019 by Campbell Lewis of 736 Cherry St., Chattanooga, TN 37402 for an 7,225 sq. ft. O'Reilly Auto Parts store to be located at 330 Plymouth Street, Halifax, MA. Said property is owned by Cumberland Farms , Inc. 165 Flanders Rd., Westborough MA 01581 as shown on Assessor's Map 63 Lot 30 book 42758 page 1. Area is zoned Business/Commercial. File #19-SPR-03 Said site plan is on file with the Town Clerk's Office, Halifax Town Hall, 499 Plymouth Street. Notice advertised in the Halifax Reporter on Friday February 15, & 22, 2019**

Present: Casey Burch; Solli Engineer and Colleen Byrne: traffic engineer.

Mr. Burch noted the location at 330 Plymouth St. and those lots and establishments surrounding the property and commercial area. There are wetlands to the south and majoring is off site. A portion in northern east corner. Proposing 7225 sq. ft. O'Reilly Auto Parts store, similar to an Auto Zone. Access is 160 from Stop & Shop, proposing 34 parking space 2 are ADA, loading area (load thru pallets loading) and dumpster receptacle with concrete pad and fence enclosure to the southern corner of the property. Monument sign will be located to the north of the driveway.

Majority of run off travels to the south, to existing wetlands, maintaining the majority of the same pattern, The parking lot will go to catch basins located in the parking area then to a water quality basin to the rear of the property. This basin was designed to attenuate to all the storm events up to 100 year storm event. Overall the site the peak discharge or rate of runoff is less that existing conditions. Utilities, sanitary comes out of the building to the northeast, into septic tank and to a pump station, pumped thru a forced main to a leaching area located on the southern portion of the property. Water coming out of the front of the building going across the Rte. 106 to the existing watermain on the other side of the road, Tying electric into an existing pole and telephone and tele-cable in conduit also traveling to the building in the north west. Gas service will travel similar to the electric service.

Proposing a hydro-dynamic separator, in lieu of as well as the water quality basin. Designed to remove (100%) floatables and 80 % of the total annual suspended solids that could result from anything in the parking area. Essentially comes in clean into this basin, and this basin is another aspect of that cleaning cycle. Eventually water runs into the wetlands to the south at the corner of the property.

Mr. Burch also went over the SEC plan, silt control plan, silt fence provided and staked hay bails as well along the wetlands. Silt sac inlet protection in the road and proposed catch basins. Did not relocate the leaching area protection (comment from review engineer) but will be around the areas of the proposed septic. Construction entrance in location of the drive.

Land scape plan, generally requires sod around building, and along front and norther portion of the property. Front will be mulch bed and scrubs, driveway has red maple, and aristocrat pear and scrubs underneath. Signage will have mulch and scrubs at base, and a diablo. Sign is about 15' high so proposed a 6' hedge. White oak in the rear.

Floor plan, approx. 7225 sq. f.t building. sales area is 3,200 sq. ft., the rest is storage and 1 office space, 2 restrooms. Elevations is typical, metal building. Front will have a little more stuck out with typical red for O'Reilly's and white oak color. Metal roofing slopes to the back with downspouts, leadis into basin.

They will not be proposing internally lite signage, will be wall sign with goose neck lighting. Sight lighting, will be wall packs on the building, and two whole mount fixtures on the southern side and on the north. Zero light spillage into the wetland area. The monument (freestanding) sign located on northern side of driveway, proposing base is 4' w' and width is 19", 12 'H and actual with O'Reilly symbol is 3' x 10", Up top is 8' wide T for the downlighting, LED that will illuminate the sign. (in current site plan)

Would like to go over wiavers. Orignially 4 now only 3. 2 are off street parking 167-14 F. Requires 73 parking spaces for building of 7225 sq. ft. Basically will only use up to 34, so will be requesting a waiver to 34

Mr. Millias asked if they provided a functioning O'Reilly's that a works, has 30' spots?

Mr. Burch said they have on with 36, but this is reduced to 34, and fine with that. Prototypical is 36 for O'Reilly. Ms. Bryne stated one is in Pittsfield, and they did a parking study recently constructed on 3 locations throughtout CT, peak demand was 14 parking spaces during a Saturday afternoon. (all stores typically this size) Try to stay under 7500 to keep under the sprinkler threshold. Will double check on cubic feet, if sprinkler system is required. Other waivers: town requires 200 sq. ft, they are providing majority of parking with that,

but some along, (pointed to plan) are 18' x 10' so it's 180 sq. ft., asking for a waiver of that. Will be 17 with that reduced size. Third waiver, the minimum loading area dimension, in the 167-3, Defines a minimum of "loading space- loading or unloading not less than 14 feet in width, 45 feet in length and 14 feet in height, not less than 1,300 sq. feet " Proposing 20.5' wide by 35' long, which again is typical O'Reilly loading. Use a WB50. Typically pull in at angle, pallet loading occurs on the concrete pad.

Members and Mr. Burch then discussed tractor trailers, lengths, beds, cabs, single axels, cabin trailers. Was there an auto turn analysis with swing in front and back into the loading space. Mr. Millias questioned the limiting of size and using a smaller truck, but sounds like they are limiting the size, but still plan on using a large truck. Mr. Burch stated that this is their prototypical size, so they know the WB... their prototypical truck will work with this loading area, and how they load. Ms. Byrne described how they come in to the site, back in to unload and pull straight out. Did with one in CT, and use WB50 and able to make turns within the site.

Mr. Skulte asked about the deliveries off hours when with no consumer traffic? Mr. Burch stated they do deliveries typically 6 or 7 am. Or right before closing, (7pm) majority in the morning. Ms. Byrne also stated that the deliveries with the WB50 occurs one a week, not everyday, and typically smaller single unit trucks during the week to supplement and supplies. Will need to go through ZBA for those waivers.

Mr. Skulte asked for him to discuss the ground water, storm water and septic system designed. Providing corporate separation from ground water, why the site. Finish elevation of the build ins at 73.5 and roadway is at 71. The existing contours dip down fast, we are proving 4 feet of separation from the ground water for the septic, (mounding, not as drastic as Dunkin Donuts) satisfying the requirements for Title V. The water was 32" belong existing. Bottom of trench at 71.9, so 4' below that. Storm water in the back? Bottom of basin is at 68', its still above the ground water elevation, providing a wet seed mix, just in case, integrated with a wetlands PO in the rear. Mr. Skulte asked if it provided the 2 feet of separation from the ground water vertically? Mr. Burch said No, but spoke with Mr. Brennan (town review engineer) but wants to apply and infiltration rate to the basin. It does go down further, this was 36', or 32' in this area, which is 2 -3 feet higher than existing grade (down here). Probably not much more drastic, but probably is in gradation difference as it is going down towards the contours. Will double check that, but wants some sort of recharge, and gave infiltration rates to apply to the basin to see if it helps with the volume reduction. Mr. Skulte added that he will be adding a fair amount of pervious surface to the site, so will have to recharge a certain amount. Mr. Burch said he may do it with at the bottom of the catch basin. Discussion continued with basins, recharging, water quality, some may be challenging. Mr. Andrews asked about the overflow? Mr. Burch stated that he doesn't believe it will reach the top, but with the 100 year storm is able to come out of the pipe and into the wetlands to the north. It retains the water in the basin for a 100 year storm. Rip wrap is provided in the emergency spillway.

It is going right up to the wetlands, and problems with Conservation. Mr. Burch will be before Con Com on the 26<sup>th</sup> and did make it aware in the application.

Mr. William Alger: (abutter) 340 Plymouth St. stated that the overflow goes right down to them. Beyond the "bank" the drainage system (doesn't exist) isn't working anymore. It just travels down, doesn't stop, drainage system is failing, full of trees and brush. Insisting that something has to be done with the overflow. Mr. Burch sated the "pond" will detain for a certain amount of time, the pipe alleviate some of the overflow coming out at once. The basin was designed to retain up to a 100 year storm. Tina Alger: 340 Plymouth St.: that bay has failed the retention system in just a little ditch, and has trees growing in it. Overflows to the wetlands in the back, now the wetlands and the water that is in the ditch in the back and flowing over our land and washing it away. I don't see how that is going to work. Makes more water and more problems for us before it gets to the Country Club.

Mr. Burch said it will reduce the peak discharge rate, we have designed to reduce peak discharge rate, so the rate of run off will be less than existing conditions right now, it will improve in that respect.

Mrs. Alger doesn't see how it can what they have now, bank isn't working and have a lot of water.

Discussion continued regarding the Mutual Bank retention area, drainage system, etc. Members asked about Conservation. The bank should have a maintenance plan in place. It was discussed about the "pipe" going thru the wetlands over into the ditch, where the water should go. The system is full of trees, goes out the back and down into the wetlands and is saturated. It is now unwalkable. Needs to stay into the ditch and blocking from entering into the Alger's property. The water from the road, Mutual Bank and any new development needs to be addressed. It was discussed to walk the property before the next meeting. Mr. Skulte asked if they ran the analysis to see if the volume would also be reduced in the proposed condition. Mr. Burch said he did not as it is designed for recharge. Review Engineer, Pat Brennan advised to use a rate of .52 inches per hour. There was also a GEO Technically investigation, and boring of soils, but tests pits for the septic designs were done, only where the septic will be going.

Mr. Alger stated that they are not opposed to the project, but the next building there will be more water, etc. and believes now is the time to rectify the problem. He also stated that there were small ponds along Monponsett St., and the water could be coming from that street as well.

Mr. Millias asked about the contours going off of the property? Mr. Burch said no, they only went about 10 feet off the property and did not go onto other peoples property. The Board of Health probably needs 30' and was looking for that information. (Farland Corp only went 10' off) The wetlands are 40' off this property line.

Comment by peer review engineer, that since everything does pitch to the wetlands, the westerly portion does now drain towards Plymouth St./ Is there a redesign or something done there. Mr. Burch stated yes, as the Highway Department has concerns because they get flooding. They have an existing pipe that runs into the middle of the property, they try to close it off, but flooding occurred worse on Rte. 106. So broke it open again. So a random pipe from yrs & yrs ago, that they use as an overflow pipe (on plan) Mr. Burch said they want to remove and dispose of it and redirect it, Spoke to Mr. Brennan, right now have it goes into a surcharge condition, soil will bubble up and use level spreader to go to the wetlands. The road during high storm events, will fill up in the system and come up into this pipe that just goes into the ground, there's nothing, no outlet to it. And that surcharge is even worse. Mr. Millias asked if the catch basin is in the pavement or saying...

Mr. Burch stated that they put new inlets along the curb because the road was widened years ago, the road was 10' more towards Stoop & shop and that used to be either a manhole or an inlet. That now is paved over and had to breakup the road. When they did this design they clogged or capped that line because it was going into someone's property. Then they needed that as an overflow, during high storm, and is open now. The pipe dead ends into the dirt but is open now. Mrs. Alger spoke of Otto's pond and all the water was going into there (across from the Fire Station). Mr. Burch stated that the Highway department had to re-open the pipe.

Mr. Skulte asked at what point does it start overflowing into the wetlands. Mr. Burch said to run the analysis you would have to do the entire. Mr. Skulte asked in reference to elevation? Mr. Burch stated some old mapping, states 67.5, along the pipe, the elevation of wetlands is at 67.5, he wanted positive pitch, which is why it is in a surcharge condition, so the bottom is at 66.5, a foot lower than existing grade, then acts as a level spreader and comes up. Other grades are at 71 and 72, so 4 foot difference. Mr. Skulte asked what is to prevent it from being the primary discharge now if your lower than the system in the street. Mr. Burch state the new line is lower than the invert of that, apparently. Mr. Skulte wanted to know what the invert to the pipes in the street. Mr. Burch does not know just informed that its lower. Looks to be roughly the same elevation. Property owner would love to close it off, but Mr. Burch believes the Highway Department does not want to, but its going into their property and may help. Might make sense to raise the inverter at the street so its not gravity flow and straight from the street out to the back. Ok with that also long as Highway Dept. doesn't require calculation of, to design the system would have to do the entire analysis to see if it works.

Discussion continued regarding the pipes, inverters, overflow, how much water, how much flow to the basin., etc. Would like to talk to the Highway Dept. Mr. Alger again explained his concern for all the water that ends up on his property, between the town, Mutual Bank, and future development.

Mr. Burch advised that they will have a maintenance manual that will go along with this project.

Mrs. Alger again stated that this water should not be dumping on her property. Mrs. Alger stated that they have has lawyers send letters to Mutual Bank and have received nothing, been to the town many times. (Mr. Peck was to do something, but now being told nothing will be done). The Algers again suggested to walk the property.

Mr. Burch stated their drainage is inside the property, not the easement. It was then discussed about an old subdivision that has been rescinded. The pipe goes to kind of a dry well, no inlet to it. Dug in that area an the pipe is damaged. Logical that the pipe went to the pit? No evidence that in the pit itself that there is an inlet there.

Mr. Alger again sated that the problem is the "bank" and the water isn't flowing thru us, its flowing over us. It was discussed about a retention pond, rip wrap. Its now a vegetated basin. It doesn't flow into the ditch, it flow onto their property. Mrs. Alger, state when the bank was being built the town wouldn't let their water from their retention pond go thru the pipe underneath our bridge into the country club, the town wanted it to go over the bridge and down into the pipe, but the land is washing away, and there is so much water, from behind the bank which is making our land, wetlands.

Members and petitioner again discussed if the pipe is there, is it connected to the ditch, what about the easement?

Maybe want to vacate that easement from the property so it is not an ecumbrance on the property.

Briefly discussed the subdivision that was rescinded, then a site plan for multifamily.

Mr. Skulte asked about the setback requirements. Mr. Burch advised they meet them.

Colleen Byrne from Solli Engineering, Traffic Study engineer. A site this small, usually don't do an impact study. Went out in Oct 2018 at the light intersection at Stop & Shop plaza as well as Happy Dragon driveway. Looked at existing conditions as well as proposed conditions after the O'Reilly's is added into the network. They utilized Rte 106, 50% in each direction. Proposed site would generate 35 trips in p.m. peak hour and on Saturday mid day peak hour is 42 trips . Focused on p.m. peak hours had the most trips. Used 10% growth rate 2018 to 2020 (build date) volumes. Proposed to operate at level service "C" is acceptable. Service entrance at Stop & Shop was level service "A" in p.m. & Saturday peak hours and continue to do so once O'Reilly is built. (4-6 p.m. and Saturday was 11 a.m. – 1 p.m.) The Q's going north bound, one cycle, distance was 193 ft. average Q of cycle was 94'. Saturday peak hour was less at 137 feet and 67 feet is average. Should see any Q'ing from signal past our driveway. She also stated that there is enough pavement to get around if someone is stopped to (take left) and get into O'Reilly's, can go around using the Happy Dragon driveway. One vehicle over 6 minutes. Reality won't happen. Software did not report any deficiencies or Q ing issues with that movement. There is adequate width.

Members stated that they have trouble getting out of Mutual Bank (taking left turn) unless someone lets them out. Traffic can get backed up to the golf course. The report does take into account heavy vehicle percentages. Mr. Skulte asked if it was even a legal left turn as you'd have to cross a double yellow line with a turn lane?

Ms. Byrne said yes. DOT will get the study, it is not State Road, the Town has jurisdiction. Mr. Skulte asked about a summer, any kind of seasonal variation you can apply to that, like an industry standard? Ms. Byrne advised she can see if DOT publishes rates for season variation for this area, they usual do it by region.

Usually not more than 2% of total traffic. Existing is 650 vehicles in p.m. peak hour, each way. Peak hour is usually 10 % of the daily traffic. Consistent to DOT reports for average daily traffic for this road.

Members asked to schedule a site visit – Mr. Burch requested to get the Highway Dept there as well. Discussion again about “the pipe” and where it may be coming from and going out? Who is responsible for it. Less than an acre site, right now, cultivated land. Mr. Alger asked to find out if it is coming from the street. Highway Dept. assured Mr. Burch that the pipe exists and they have uncovered it, while doing test pits for the septic. Along the way it had breaks, and leaking out, completely covered. Could not find the outlet at that time. The survey theoretically shows as a dry well is off to the left.

Mrs. Alger believes the pipe was there when the “chicken farm” was in progress and tied into the main drain and it was being piped under the road and into the main drain and into the field. Was to just drain farm land and believe as the town grew they let everyone dump in there, Monponsett and Plymouth Streets. Ditches became wider. That’s how the pipe went under the road and into that land. When they did the road over, they closed that pipe, and closed off it, to go into that land. She stated they did not know the Town uncovered it because they have water and making their land wetlands.

Mr. Burch reiterated that this was what the Highway Dept told him, but stated the ‘guy’ told him they had to break it open to release some of the flooding occurring in the road. Mr. Skulte suggested to run a closed circuit TV thru it. (maybe the Highway Dept can do it)

Mrs. Alger again stated the ditches are Mr. Pecks, he was to fix it, and he has to maintain them. But when the bank came in it made his land wetlands because it isn’t working. The town allowed it to go thru and wont do anything about it.

Mr. Skulte asked about the pending conservation filing, you have to walk the site with the agent. It is scheduled for next Tuesday. Members agreed to schedule a site walk, for a joint meeting with Planning, Conservation, Solli Eng., Highway and the Algers.

Mr. Andrews asked if Mr. Burch had responded to our review Engineer. Mr. Burch stated not formally but did talk with them and went thru the plan. He spoke of the traditional septic for O’Reilly’s but that is Board of Health jurisdiction. Secretary will be in touch for time and day of site walk.

Motion to continue public hearing on March 21<sup>st</sup> at 6:35 p.m.

MOTION: Mark Millias

SECOND: Karlis Skulte

All in favor

Motion to re-open the regular Planning Board meeting

MOTION: Mark Millias

SECOND: Karlis Skulte

All in Favor

#### Informal Discussion:

David Burgess: 35 Orchard Cr. (Deerfield Est.) designed in 1997, Lot 9 for sale has drainage easement. Would like to know if he can modify the storm drainage. Wants to make it subterranean for the purpose of growing grass. Plenty of trap rock and material. 2 spill ways, inlet under easement (with abutter) filled with debris. Town has not cleaned out, current owner says that the drainage never has more than 1 foot and drains quickly. Would like to know process of to make it a level subterranean devise. Mr. Millias advised the Highway Dept would need to be involved and be engineered. Members discussed the volume of area involved and the cost involved. They discussed square footage, volume of water, number of chambers required etc. Advised to contact an engineer for costs and engineering before going forward. Will have to go back to Conservation Comm, as it is within 100 ft of wetlands. Gave name & number of engineer off drainage report. Rough estimate would be 100 chambers with high costs. Discussions continued regarding engineers and costs, if drainage can even be changed, easements, brought up to current 100 yr. storm design

etc. Neighbors on both sides would need to be notified. Maybe come back once have more information, research further with engineers.

Form A: 395 Plymouth St.

Submitted earlier (same day) approved one prior, (not recorded) Getting the septic onto the front lot, which board asked to do and are before the Zoning Board again next week. Trying to get as conforming as possible. Septic on house lot, also asked to get building razed. Plan now states "Ex Bldg to be razed". Pre existing Non-conforming lot/use. Discussed if it can be approved & endorsed as it is now creating a zoning violation. Can they put conditions on the Form A, to remove the building as indicated on plan. ANR is Approval not requiring Subdivision control only. Last time attorney opinion advised Planning Board has no reason to deny. Not on posted agenda so do not have to approve today. Put on next meeting, try to get building removed.

Bills payable:

Motion to pay bill for Plympton/Halifax Express Public Hearing notice, legal Ad #10427 in the amount of \$84.00 for the RG Automotive site plan review

MOTION: Mark Millias

SECOND: Karlis Skulte

All in favor

Update: Allan Cutler emailed 3/4/19 and advised will be starting up the "goat grazing" program this May or June, no changes from what was discussed last year and will keep us up to date.

Postal Kiosks located on Riders Way: Mr. Fabroski new development, postal service will not deliver as they require mailbox kiosk at beginning of subdivisions. C. Selig also had similar issue discussion with Dracut. Asked if we wanted to set up meeting with post office. Need common area within subdivision, in road layout? Typically in street layout. Need someone to come in and explain, what is required. Local policy, town not advised? Will invite to next meeting.

Motion to approve meeting minutes of Feb. 21, 2019

MOTION: Mark Millias

SECOND: Karlis Skulte

All in favor

Motion to adjourn

MOTION: Karlis Skulte

SECOND: Mark Millias

All in favor

It was unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

**Date Approved:** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Terri Renaud  
Planning Board Secretary