

1 MILFORD PLANNING BOARD MINUTES ~ APPROVED

2 May 18, 2021 Board of Selectmen's Meeting Room, 6:30 PM

3
4 **Members Present:**

5 Doug Knott, Chairman

6 Tim Finan, Vice Chairman

7 Paul Amato, Member

8 Janet Langdell, Member

9 Pete Basiliere, Member

10 Susan Robinson, Member

11 Dave Freel, Selectmen's Rep

Staff:

Jason Cleghorn, Town Planner

Darlene Bouffard, Recording Secretary

12
13
14
15 **MEETING PREAMBLE DURING COVID-19 EMERGENCY**

16 *Good Evening, as Chairman of the Planning Board, I am declaring that an emergency exists and I am*
17 *invoking the provisions of RSA 91-A:2, III (b). Federal, State, and Local officials have determined that*
18 *gatherings of 10 or more people pose a substantial risk to our community in its continuing efforts to*
19 *combat the spear of COVID-19. In concurring with their determination, I also find that this meeting is*
20 *imperative to the continued operation of Town government and services, which are vital to public safety*
21 *and confidence during this emergency. As such, this meeting will be conducted without a quorum of this*
22 *body physically present in the same location.*

23 *At this time, I also welcome members of the public accessing this meeting remotely. Even though this*
24 *meeting is being conducted in a unique manner under unusual circumstances, the usual rules of conduct*
25 *and decorum apply.*

26 *Public comments will be limited to three minutes per person. Any person found to be disrupting this*
27 *meeting will be asked to cease the disruption. If the disruptive behavior continues thereafter, that*
28 *person will be removed from this meeting.*

29 *Please note that all votes that are taken during this meeting must and will be done by Roll Call Vote.*

30 *Let's start the meeting by taking a Roll Call attendance. When each member states their name, also*
31 *please state whether there is anyone in the room with you during this meeting, which is required under*
32 *the Right-to-Know Law.*

33
34 Members and staff were polled individually: Tim Finan was in his office alone; J. Langdell at her home in the
35 room alone; P. Amato was at his home in the room alone; S. Robinson was at her home in the room alone; P.
36 Basiliere was at his home in the room alone; D. Freel at home in the room alone; D. Knott at home alone in
37 the room; J. Cleghorn was alone in his home office; D. Bouffard was in her home office alone

38
39 **1. Call to order:**

40 D. Knott called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. indicating that tonight there are three new applications and
41 one application that was continued to be heard tonight.

42
43 **2. Public Hearing(s):**

- 44
45 **a) Case SP2021-14 Starboard Tack, LLC and Shattuck Paving (owners/applicant).** Conceptual site plan
46 review to convert an existing boat storage yard into an equipment and material storage yard, convert the
47 existing building from 4,300 s.f. of warehouse space and 2,900 s.f. of retail space into a 3,455 s.f.
48 warehouse, 865 sf of office space, and 2,900 s.f. of retail space. The parcel is located at 1 Westchester St.
49 in the Industrial "I" zoning district. Tax Map 15 Lot 15-1.

50
51 P. Amato asked why this is not being brought forward as a Change of Use? J. Cleghorn said the minor
52 site plan is the mechanism to do that, this is just conceptual tonight. D. Knott asked if retail is normally
53 allowed in the Industrial zone?

54 Attorney Jason Bielas, representing the Shattucks, is here tonight with Sam Foise from Meridian who
55 has the plan to present. Attorney Bielas said on the memo provided, it explains the retail aspect; the

Boat Yard stored boats and sold an amount of retail. Shattuck will not be using all the space they will have and would like to lease that extra space out for future use. That is consistent with the current use. This use is going from boats storage and sales, to equipment storage and retail space, it would not be a significant change of use. D. Freel asked if landscape materials will be stored at this site and how will that be mitigated? Attorney Bielagus said that would be minimal, the Site Plan has equipment storage and the materials that will be on site would be much less than what is in the area already. There are some restrictions in the area already. There is a plan to have a buffer in place which would alleviate dust and debris issues. J. Cleghorn noted that he has not seen that plan.

S. Robinson did not see anything in the packet that talks about storing landscape materials. Attorney Bielagus responded that the Milford memo dated May 12, 2021 has the property site plan as it will be used by Shattuck; the company does paving jobs and has a landscaping business as well. S. Robinson was not aware of the landscaping business. D. Knott asked if they do snow removal and will they store salt at this location? Ron Shattuck answered at this time they will not, but he would like to leave that open for the future. D. Knott stated this parcel is in the groundwater protection area and it is close to Tucker Brook. D. Knott asked what would be used on this site? Ron Shattuck answered it will have asphalt. D. Knott said this is a Level 1 storm water area. S. Robinson asked if this will have production of asphalt? Attorney Bielagus said the Site Plan Concept has a plan for gravel and PVC pipes as a mitigation effort to prevent run off or groundwater issues.

S. Foisie, Meridian, said the gravel parking in the rear is pervious, which would allow run off as though it were paved. P. Amato asked why there is a monitoring well on the site? S. Foisie is not sure, it might have been from many years ago but it is not monitored. P. Amato asked if the applicant has gone to a Conservation Commission meeting? J. Cleghorn said the Conservation Commission has reviewed the plan, but the applicant did not attend a meeting. S. Foisie said tonight is only to identify the Board's feelings on changing this from a Boat Storage yard to a place to store Shattuck Paving equipment. D. Freel said it is not the same thing, he is okay with this as long as it does not affect the ground water. S. Robinson agreed. D. Knott said this is an allowed use in the Industrial zone.

J. Cleghorn would like to get the Board view on this, we are looking at buffering, the plan he saw did not have anything on the plan that showed buffering and that is an important piece to staff. The trip generation and traffic flow of boat storage versus a use of this nature is not the same level of activity. The application stated this is seasonal but it is an increased impact to that lot and staff is interested in the view of the Planning Board and its view on the impact to the lot. J. Cleghorn stated the applicant is also interested in leasing space to similar uses to store vehicles. J. Langdell said with renting out space for other similar businesses, is this to become an industrial condominium? Also, J. Langdell said retail is not an acceptable use in the Industrial zone. J. Langdell does not recall how the boat yard was using it as retail space, it might have been a variance. Renting out space for similar business equipment will bring in far more traffic from the existing use. That intersection is of concern. P. Amato said you could put a warehouse use there, the trucks will leave in the morning and come back at the end of the day, but it is not going to be continuous traffic. J. Langdell said they are also looking at using space for other companies, but we do not know what companies they are or the impact they could bring.

S. Foisie said the landscaping requirements are already on the site now, the trees are in good condition, the buffers are well established. Sam might need to update the buffer because of the change of use, to increase the buffer on the Westchester side. The use will only be as much as the space allows. He cannot speak about any potential leasers. Shattuck has about 10 trucks that leave the site in the morning and return at the end of the day. This use will produce 60 trips per day on Elm Street. T. Finan said he is most concerned about the Elm Street side of the property facing Elm Street with an ice cream place across the street. T. Finan asked if storing materials (to grind up) will be the only process there, what kind of noise does that produce and does anything get added in that process? S. Foisie responded that only takes place twice per year. S. Robinson confirmed that process is only twice per year and would the applicant make the landscaping buffer more dense than it is now (for the ice cream place)? S. Foisie said he and Ron Shattuck talked about a fence on that side of the property. S. Foisie does not know the amount of noise. The waste product from paving is stored on the site until it is re-ground the next time. S. Robinson

asked if that material is stored inside or outside? P. Amato said the asphalt gets processed on site on this site. P. Basiliere asked if Ron can answer anything that Sam might not be able to answer. Ron Shattuck said we are not manufacturing materials there; we do not have any intention to do that. S. Robinson confirmed there will be no high volume noise or dust in the air? Ron Shattuck said no, 2-3 days twice a year is when asphalt gets ground up, 7 am to 4 p.m. are the hours.

P. Basiliere said this is a conceptual discussion and he is pleased that the boat yard can be used by a similar use, this seems logical for this site and it is allowed, but he would like to get assurance that any materials stored on site follow groundwater regulations and does not pollute the aquifer. P. Basiliere is concerned that this is a noisy operation in a residential area and would want an adequate buffer in that area and would like dust mitigation since there are residences across the street. His biggest concern is the traffic turning on to Westchester, with the entrance of Haywards being right there, the town needs to look at that and if anything can be done on the road with the congestion. P. Basiliere said there is also a school just across Westchester Drive from this site and he will be looking at the traffic mitigation and noise/dust mitigation. P. Amato does not know if there will be a noise issue.

D. Knott asked if the Westchester end of the overlay District has any other requirements? P. Amato said this was here before the zoning was in place. D. Knott asked if the discussion was satisfactory for the applicant? Ron Shattuck said the owner of the boat yard did put in a lot of landscaping, and he agrees that a buffer or a fence is important, but the noise should not be an issue, the crews leave early in the morning and come back at different times of day, typically they use the bypass to travel instead of through town. D. Knott added that if there is ever a thought of storing salt on site, it will need to be fully contained because of the level 1 groundwater. J. Langdell asked how big is the pile of used asphalt that gets ground up twice a year? Ron Shattuck answered 50' x 50' and about 15' high; it is just stacked up with a loader.

- b) **Case SP2021-13 SCF RC Funding I, LLC and Hillson Contractors, Inc. (owners/applicant).** Minor Site Plan review for the addition of a second drive-thru lane, façade and landscaping changes to an existing Wendy's restaurant. The parcel is located at 153 Elm St. in the Commercial "C" zoning district. Tax Map 19 Lot 6.

P. Amato moved to accept the application for review. P. Basiliere seconded. A poll was taken: P. Amato yes; P. Basiliere yes; T. Finan yes; J. Langdell yes; S. Robinson yes; D. Freel yes; D. Knott yes.

J. Langdell moved no potential regional impact. P. Basiliere seconded. A poll was taken: J. Langdell yes; P. Basiliere yes; S. Robinson yes; D. Freel yes; T. Finan yes; P. Amato yes; D. Knott yes.

Jason Cleghorn read the abutters list. Pam Torsiello, Brookstone Manor abutter, was present. Chad Branon, Fieldstone, representing the applicant was helping to facilitate the Site Plan for a second drive-through at the Wendy's property. C. Branon shared his screen to present the architectural plans; he explained the cars would queue in one line and then break into two lines to place an order. The Wendy's franchise is updating locations with the current brand and signage. Some of the shrubs were removed during the update of the facade and will be replaced in kind. P. Amato asked about parking, since some of the parking is being removed for this change. C. Branon said they will replace some of the parking but this is are still in compliance with the requirements. It was felt that by adding the drive through function it will help the business since most customers do not go into the building but instead just drive through and the exit.

D. Knott asked about any traffic impact on Elm Street? C. Branon thinks this will actually help with any Elm Street traffic. J. Langdell asked what is the seating requirement for this business? J. Cleghorn did not have that in front of him. C. Branon knows it meets the ordinance and has tried to facilitate the application and can address the seating requirements, there are six seats per one space plus one space per employee and the applicant is not asking for any waivers. J. Langdell stated she would like staff to address the seating requirements. J. Cleghorn said he did not have that information in front of him, based on the size of the building, and the number of seats, he believes it will meet the parking requirements.

Further, C. Branon stated this will not change the way the drive through functions, we are trying to dedicate the east side parking spaces for employees so that there are no conflicts with the customer parking. P. Amato said that is where the handicapped spaces are located, asking if there is enough space to go around the back of the building if you do not go through the drive-through? C. Branon responded there is enough space for that. P. Basiliere asked how wide are the lanes? C. Branon said the lanes are 10 feet wide. P. Basiliere asked about trucks going through, will they fit? C. Branon said there is a height restriction, so box trucks could not go through the drive through. P. Basiliere asked where deliveries are made? How will delivery trucks bring in product? Is it in the back? C. Branon believes that delivery trucks will come during the night and the parking spaces in back were eliminated to allow for those deliveries. P. Basiliere asked if the space between the two lanes could be tightened up? C. Branon can talk to the applicant about that.

S. Robinson likes the new design. J. Cleghorn did route these plans to Fire and Ambulance who had no comments about the space around the facility and there were no other comments from them. C. Branon believes there are 50 seats in the buildings and it meets the requirements, we can add a note to the plan and limit the number of seats plus one parking space for each employee. J. Langdell just wants to make sure that the plan meets the regulations. There were no further comments or questions from the Board. D. Knott opened the meeting to the public.

Pam Torisello, Brookstone Manor Landlord and abutter, asked if the tree buffer between this property and Brookstone Manor will be kept or will there be any changes to that? C. Branon said there are not any changes planned for that buffer. There was some tree maintenance done to the trees. There were no further questions or comments from the public. D. Knott closed the public portion of the meeting.

D. Freel moved to approve the applicant with the condition to add the note to the plan for parking so they will meet the parking requirement. P. Basiliere seconded the motion and added that the motion should also include widening the drive through aisles and minimize the space between the two drive through aisles. D. Freel agreed to the amendment to his motion. A poll was taken: D. Freel yes; P. Basiliere yes; S. Robinson yes; J. Langdell yes; T. Finan yes; P. Amato yes; D. Knott yes. Motion passed.

A short break was taken.

- c) **Case SP2021-15 Heritage Hill Industrial Park, LLC (owners/applicant).** Major Site Plan review and Conditional Use Permit review for self-storage at the southwest corner of the intersection of Savage and Phelan Rd. The site plan contains four (4) self-storage buildings totaling 43,800 s.f. The parcel is located in the Industrial "I" zoning district. Tax Map 6 Lot 33.

P. Basiliere moved to accept the application for review. T. Finan seconded. A poll was taken: S. Robinson yes; P. Amato yes; J. Langdell yes; T. Finan yes; P. Basiliere yes; T. Finan yes; D. Knott yes. Motion passed.

J. Langdell moved no potential regional impact with this application. P. Amato seconded. A poll was taken: J. Langdell yes; P. Amato yes; D. Freel yes; S. Robinson yes; T. Finan yes; P. Basiliere yes; D. Knott yes. Motion passed.

Paul Amato recused himself from further voting on this application as he is an abutter. Chad Branon, Fieldstone Engineering, is representing the applicant, along with Scott Gauthier who is seeking approval of Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for self-storage units on this parcel. D. Knott indicated that Scott Gauthier is his landlord, asking if he should also recuse himself? J. Langdell asked if D. Knott has any material or financial interest in this application? D. Knott replied he does not. The Board felt D. Knott did not need to recuse.

C. Branon explained this is a 4.467 acre parcel along Savage Road in the Industrial zone. The proposal is already partially developed. The site has a lot of vegetation since the site improvements were done back in 2005 for an Industrial complex, which was an approved site plan. There are two access points, this

project will take what was previously done and convert to self-storage facility. This will be 4 buildings, ranging in size. There will be access aisles between buildings. Emergency access through the facility is available at each access point. All local and State drainage requirements are met. Back in 2005 there was a landscape plan along the front of the site. The applicant would prefer to have a very slight pitch on the roof for a slower melt during winter, or a steeper roof could be considered which would require more maintenance. D. Knott said the steeper the roof, the more aesthetically pleasing, however it does create a problem with snow melt. C. Branon said the lower profile roof would remain unseen on Savage Road, the more peaked roof would be seen on Savage Road. An AoT permit has already been received for this and the drainage will be worked through them. A stormwater management plan was submitted to the Town consultant who recommended a catch basin. C. Branon said that initially a waiver was requested for storm water management but instead the note was updated to reflect the new stormwater engineering recommendation.

D. Knott noted the AoT has expired and needs renewal from the State. C. Branon will work with the State on that. C. Branon said this is for self-storage and it will be for inside storage only. Lighting is proposed to be LED in accordance with town requirements. The town requires down cast cut off lights that will be placed along the sides of the buildings. J. Langdell asked if there is any plan to do any rentals (like U-Haul) out of this facility? C. Branon said there are not. P. Basiliere asked why one item is struck out on the plan. J. Cleghorn responded that because this plan does not abut any residences, he wanted that note removed. P. Basiliere asked if signs are proposed for this site, asking why that would not be on the Site Plan? C. Branon's understanding is that a sign permit is usually sought once the buildings are built so the client will handle that separately. The sign application will need to show the design and size when it gets requested. P. Basiliere said in the plan it refers to PSNH, which should be Eversource. C. Branon said that will get corrected. T. Finan asked will there be outside storage here? C. Branon said there will be no outside storage at this time. T. Finan asked is there room for parking on this site, for someone that may store a fancy car and park there everyday car to take out the fancy car for the day? C. Branon responded he has never provided parking spaces for self-storage units. T. Finan knows people that do this exact thing. C. Branon feels the everyday car would just be put in the storage unit for the day, there is no formal parking proposed, there is a 30' wide aisle in back but if a nice car is stored in a unit, he thinks they would park their car in the unit once the other car is pulled out. T. Finan asked if there is an office on site or will it be an automated system? C. Branon said it is an on line system and the users are given an access code; there is no town water or sewer on site.

J. Cleghorn said this application was reviewed by emergency services and they had no comments. The staff preference would be to have the peaked roof on this project. J. Langdell said this is in the West Elm Overlay district, and to compare it to the Powers Street application that had a more flat roof is not apples to apples. C. Branon said because of the elevation of this site, this will not be seen, it comes down to the surroundings and the neighboring property will be a solar farm. P. Basiliere asked what the view would be coming down Savage Road? C. Branon showed the Board the street view from the other direction. Seeing no other comments or questions from the Board, D. Knott opened the public portion of the meeting.

P. Amato said the trees along this site are about 15' tall, so the buildings will not be visible from the Market Basket side, but from the other side coming down Savage Road, they will be visible, and for that reason he prefers the peaked roof. P. Amato asked if this lot will be fenced? C. Branon said no, it will be gated and have security cameras. Hearing no further comments from the public, D. Knott closed the public hearing.

D. Knott would prefer the more flat roof to avoid chloride being used for ice buildup on pavement. C. Branon said the lower profile roof was in the original package but both options are on the table. D. Freel asked if the lower profile roof is used, will it need to be made with stronger steel? C. Branon said either way, it does not make a difference with the materials. D. Freel is sure whatever is decided by the Planning Board, the Building Department will follow up on how it gets built. D. Freel asked are most of the self-storage units made with peaked roofs? J. Cleghorn is unsure about all of them in Milford, but the Powers Street self-storage plan had a request from the Planning Board for a peaked roof. D. Freel asked if it is in the regulations? T. Finan said it is not in the regulations, it is just preferred. J. Langdell said in

the West Elm Overlay district a peaked roof is “preferred”. C. Branon said the majority of self-storage units in Milford have a lower profile roof with a 12/1 pitch. Consensus of the Board was as follows: D. Freel 12/1 pitch; J. Langdell 12/3 pitch; S. Robinson 12/3 pitch; P. Basiliere 12/3 pitch; T. Finan 12/3 pitch; D. Knott 12/1 pitch. The consensus showed that a 12/3 pitch is preferred (peaked roof). J. Cleghorn said there needs to be positive findings on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) criteria; the Board needs to find that the application meets all the criteria.

D. Knott said the first criteria is that it meet public need and convenience, the second is the property in question is reasonably suited for the use requested, third is the access to the facilities are appropriate, fourth is that the building design is compatible with the surrounding facilities and fifth is landscaping shall provide adequate visual mitigation to abutting properties. J. Langdell said there is certainly a demand for convenient storage, this is a nice location for this type of activity, a little off the beaten path but not overly, it is easy to get to and it is a piece of property that has not been developed and has been sitting there for quite some time, Chad has shown there is adequate lay out for getting in and out of the site safely; consideration has been given for an alternate design and landscaping and screening has been modified from the original plan per the Conservation Commission comments and does reflect a nice variety of plantings.

Scott Gauthier has concerns with the peaked roof, he would prefer the lower pitch cost-wise. He observed some other units in town and took photos and witnessed the snow curling off the roofs and with ice damming. There were people that had to shovel out their own units to get into them; functionally, the manufacturer suggests in New England the slighter pitch helps the snow stay on and not curl off. D. Knott asked if that information could be provided to the Town Planning Department, to which Scott said he could provide that.

D. Knott feels the applicant has provided enough evidence to support the lower pitch and can provide support to back that up. S. Gauthier would prefer the lower pitch to the peaked. D. Knott asked what is presented to approve? S. Gauthier would rather do the lower pitch with the landscaping. D. Knott stated it sounds like the applicant is withdrawing the peaked roof. J. Cleghorn responded that staff is not in support of that, but it is the Board’s decision. T. Finan asked if an opinion can be gotten from the Building Department and how the Code Enforcement Officers feel about the argument with the peaked roof? J. Cleghorn stated the town has other self-storage units with peaked roofs, they were looked at as an example, J. Cleghorn can ask but that would not help with this tonight. J. Langdell is not sure this is a building issue per se, it is a maintenance issue, it’s that more snow gets dumped and needs more salt and/or cleanup for the number of months we have snow in New England. C. Branon said the majority of self-storage units are the design that the applicant would like to do on this site; he has had clients that have used the peaked roofs and have regretted it because it’s been a maintenance issue.

D. Freel indicated the building inspectors are going to make sure that whatever the Planning Board signs off on is what is built to the code but to ask them what the Planning Board should go with, he does not think we need to go there. J. Langdell said the peaked roof is now off the table per the applicant, so the Planning Board needs to go back to the Conditional Use Permit criteria. D. Freel suggested the consensus of the Board be considered again and if all now favor the flatter roof we go forward. Members reviewed the other storage facilities in proximity to this property, C. Branon noting that some have the flat roof and some have the peaked roof. J. Langdell is concerned about setting a precedent. C. Branon asked if another consensus could be considered by the Board and then go from there? D. Freel stated with the Board of Selectmen, they can make a motion and if it doesn’t pass they can make a different motion. J. Langdell said with the Planning Board if it doesn’t pass it gets denied, we are accepting or denying an application, the votes are a little bit different. D. Freel said he was just trying to get to the peaked or not peaked roof. J. Langdell said no, if it gets denied it gets denied we can’t then just make another motion.

D. Freel asked if the applicant would then have to come back with a different design? D. Knott said that is correct. T. Finan asked about the Perry Road self-storage units that were just done and did Chad say those had the flat roof like what is proposed here? Chad said that is correct. Jason Cleghorn stated there is a mix throughout town. It is because this is in the West Elm Overlay District where flat roofs are generally discouraged, it does not say they are prohibited. Staff has expressed its concern but it is up to

the Planning Board. P. Basiliere suggested maybe we should take another straw poll on the new information brought forward by Mr. Gauthier to see if anyone's vote has changed on the roof.

D. Knott took another consensus vote: P. Basiliere 12/3; T. Finan 12/1; D. Freel 12/1; J. Langdell 12/3; S. Robinson prefers the 12/3 but if the 12/1 is better for the town in some way she will go with that – D. Knott said you can't vote for both – S. Robinson 12/1; D. Knott 12/1.

T. Finan moved to conditionally approve the application as presented with the flatter (12/1) roof. D. Freel seconded. A poll was taken: S. Robinson yes; T. Finan yes; J. Langdell yes because the pitch of the roof is not enough to deny this whole application in my mind; D. Freel yes; P. Basiliere yes because the pitch of the roof is not enough to deny the whole application; D. Knott yes. Motion passes.

P. Amato stepped back up on the Board.

- d) Case SP2021-04 Mengyuan Property Management and Frank Kling (applicants/owners).** Review for a major site plan application to construct a six (6) unit townhouse, multi-family residential project with related parking, drainage/stormwater management, landscaping, and lighting improvements. The parcel is located at 159 Elm Street in the Commercial C zoning district. Tax Map 19 Lot 5. Continued from the March 16, 2021 meeting.

J. Cleghorn stated the applicant has requested that this be continued to June 15, 2021. P. Amato moved that this application be continued to the June 15, 2021 meeting and that the abutters be re-notified. J. Langdell seconded. A poll was taken: P. Basiliere yes; S. Robinson yes; D. Freel yes; T. Finan yes; P. Amato yes; J. Langdell yes; D. Knott yes. Motion passed.

- 3. Other Business:** D. Knott mentioned the election of officers is on the agenda. J. Langdell asked if D. Knott and T. Finan are willing to serve another three years as Chairman and Vice Chairman? They both answered they are willing. T. Finan's term renewal date was discussed briefly. (UPDATE T. Finan's term was renewed in February 2021 for another 3-year term, set to expire in 2024.)

J. Langdell moved to elect D. Knott as Chair and T. Finan as Vice Chair for another year (March 2022). P. Amato seconded. A poll was taken: J. Langdell yes; P. Amato yes; S. Robinson yes; P. Basiliere yes; T. Finan yes; D. Freel yes; D. Knott yes. Motion passed.

As far as the June meetings, there was discussion about whether it would be in person or via zoom. It was decided that the June 1, 2021 meeting would be hybrid allowing those that are comfortable to attend in person and others can attend via Zoom. Jason Cleghorn had asked Chris Gentry about the hybrid meetings and was told they are not a problem and the in person portion would be in the Board of Selectmen Room since it is all wired up.

- 4. Meeting Minutes:** The Planning Board minutes of February 2, 2021 were reviewed. S. Robinson moved to conditionally approve the minutes with the change made by J. Langdell. P. Amato seconded. A poll was taken: J. Langdell yes; P. Amato yes; S. Robinson yes; P. Basiliere yes; T. Finan yes; D. Freel yes; D. Knott yes. Motion passed.

Recognizing a few items needed clarification on the 2/16/21 minutes, J. Langdell moved to table the approval of the February 16, 2021 minutes to June, 2021. P. Amato seconded. A poll was taken: J. Langdell yes; P. Amato yes; S. Robinson yes; P. Basiliere yes; T. Finan yes; D. Freel yes; D. Knott yes. Motion passed.

- 5. Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 9:32 p.m. on a motion made by P. Amato and seconded by P. Basiliere. A poll was taken: P. Amato, yes; P. Basiliere, yes; J. Langdell, yes; S. Robinson, yes; D. Freel yes; T. Finan yes; D. Knott yes. The next Planning Board (hybrid) work session is June 1, 2021.

376 _____ Date: _____
377 Signature of the Chairperson/Vice-Chairperson:
378

379
380 MINUTES OF THE 5/18/21 MEETING WERE APPROVED 6/15/21

APPROVED