

4 **Members Present:**

5 Doug Knott, Chairman  
6 Tim Finan, Vice Chairman  
7 Paul Amato, Member  
8 Janet Langdell, Member  
9 Pete Basiliere, Alternate Member  
10 Susan Robinson, Member  
11

**Staff:**

Lincoln Daley, Com Dev Director  
Darlene Bouffard, Recording Secretary

12 **Excused:**

13 Laura Dudziak, Selectmen's Rep.  
14  
15

16  
17 **MEETING PREAMBLE DURING COVID-19 EMERGENCY**

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

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

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

31 *Please note that all votes that are taken during this meeting must and will be done by Roll Call Vote.*  
32 *Let's start the meeting by taking a Roll Call attendance. When each member states their name, also*  
33 *please state whether there is anyone in the room with you during this meeting, which is required under*  
34 *the Right-to-Know Law.*  
35

36 Members and staff were polled individually: T. Finan was in his office alone; J. Langdell at her home in the  
37 room alone; P. Amato was at his home in the room alone; P. Basiliere was at his home in the room alone; S.  
38 Robinson was at her home in the room alone; D. Knott was in his office alone. Staff Lincoln Daley was alone  
39 in the room and Darlene Bouffard was alone in her room.  
40

41 **1. Call to order:**

42 Chairman Knott called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. indicating that tonight there five applications to be  
43 heard followed by the second public review of the proposed Zoning Amendments. L. Daley asked if one item  
44 could be taken out of order tonight? L. Daley indicated that Zachary Clark has requested his application to be  
45 taken up at the February 2, 2021 Planning Board meeting, so if there is anyone on this zoom meeting for that  
46 application, if the Planning Board concurs, that item will be moved to February 2, 2021. L. Daley explained  
47 that the Board needs to make a motion to continue that application to a different date. J. Langdell moved to  
48 continue the application for Zachary Clark to the February 2, 2021 Planning Board meeting as requested by  
49 the applicant. S. Robinson seconded. A poll was taken: P. Amato yes; P. Basiliere yes; T. Finan yes; S.  
50 Robinson yes; J. Langdell yes; D. Knott yes. Therefore the application for Zachary Clark will be heard  
51 February 2, 2021, no additional notices will be sent.  
52  
53  
54  
55

56 **2. Public Hearing(s):**

- 57
- 58 **a. Leonard Golden and Marilyn Piekarski Trustee (applicants/owners) – Review for**
- 59 **acceptance and consideration of final approval for a plan revocation and an amendment to**
- 60 **a previously approved lot line adjustment. The parcels are located at 60 Mason Road and**
- 61 **221 Osgood Road in the Residential R zoning district. Tax Map 42, Lots 55 and 50-1.**

62

63 P. Amato recused himself from this application, since he is an abutter. T. Finan moved to accept the

64 application for review. J. Langdell seconded. A poll was taken: S. Robinson yes; P. Basiliere yes; J.

65 Langdell yes, T. Finan yes, D. Knott yes. Motion passed.

66

67 J. Langdell moved no potential regional impact for this application. T. Finan seconded. A poll was taken:

68 S. Robinson yes; T. Finan yes; J. Langdell yes; P. Basiliere yes; D. Knott yes. The abutters were read by

69 D. Knott.

70

71 Beth Davis, Attorney and Gerry Prunier, Attorney, will represent the applicant. B. Davis appreciates all

72 that were involved in this property over the years and are here tonight for this meeting. Previously one

73 extra site was not addressed through a lot merger but it must be done with a recorded plan and brings us

74 here tonight. The Golden's had a title search done and it was found that some items which needed to be

75 taken care of were not and that is what is being brought forward tonight, we are trying to get the title in

76 the right place with the right people. J. Langdell asked what is the position of Gerry Prunier with the

77 applicant? G. Prunier stated he is representing the applicant. T. Finan asked if this adjustment brings the

78 land back to its previous configuration? G. Prunier said yes. L. Daley asked G. Prunier to explain what

79 plan it will revert back to. G. Prunier answered Map 42 lot 50-1 without the triangle parcel, on tonight's

80 plan, Parcel A will be added to Map/Lot 42-55. L. Daley's recommendation is to revoke the 12/26/17

81 plan recorded at the Hillsborough County Registry of Deeds Plan #39732 and record this plan as well. J.

82 Langdell thanked L. Daley for his clarification of the actions being taken. L. Daley suggested that this be

83 supported for revocation and for action on this Lot Line Adjustment be taken. D. Knott opened the public

84 portion of the meeting. L. Daley did not see anyone in the waiting room to speak.

85

86 Dave Palance was unable to "raise his hand" but was present in the meeting; he stated he has no

87 comments. D. Knott asked for a motion from the Board.

88

89 J. Langdell moved to revoke the 2017 plan as presented. T. Finan seconded. A poll was taken: J.

90 Langdell yes; T. Finan yes; P. Basiliere yes; S. Robinson yes; D. Knott yes. Motion passed with P.

91 Amato recusing himself. J. Langdell move to accept the Lot Line Adjustment with the condition of

92 adding a signature block on the plan. T. Finan seconded. A poll was taken: J. Langdell yes; T. Finan yes;

93 S. Robinson yes; P. Basiliere yes; D. Knott yes. Motion passed with P. Amato recusing himself.

- 94
- 95 **b. Andrea Morais (applicant/owner) – Review for acceptance and consideration of final approval for**
- 96 **the conversion of an existing duplex into a two unit condominium. The parcel is located at 37-39**
- 97 **Federal Hill Road in the Residential R zoning district. Tax Map 48, Lot 30.**

98

99 P. Amato stepped back up to the Board. P. Amato moved to accept the plan for review. P. Basiliere

100 seconded. A poll was taken: P. Amato yes; P. Basiliere yes; T. Finan yes; S. Robinson yes; J. Langdell

101 yes; D. Knott yes. Motion passed.

102

103 J. Langdell moved no potential regional impact associated with this application. S. Robinson seconded.

104 A poll was taken: J. Langdell yes; S. Robinson yes; T. Finan yes; P. Basiliere yes; D. Knott yes. Motion

105 passed. L. Daley read abutters list.

106

107 John Yule, representing the applicant, presented the plan explaining this is an existing duplex built in

108 1978 that has been rented out since then. The applicant would like to convert the residence in to two

109 condo units and maybe sell one or both units. There are no changes to the building, it is just a change in

110 ownership. D. Knott asked if the dumpster, as shown on the street side view of the presentation, is always

111 located there? John Yule responded that it was not there when he was there. L. Daley said the applicant  
112 should find out if that is just a temporary dumpster placement or permanent placement; if it is a  
113 permanent placement it should be screened, since that is a requirement. J. Yule asked if the plan could  
114 have a note that states if the dumpster is permanent it must be screened. L. Daley said the parking should  
115 also be within the parking spaces and not in the town Right of Way (ROW), could that parking area be  
116 evened out in order to allow for better parking? J. Yule could add to the plan where parking is allowed  
117 and where it is not allowed. L. Daley appreciates that, in order to allow enforcement. By evening out that  
118 parking area, it would be safer for pedestrians and for cars.

119  
120 J. Langdell asked if there is a wall on this property? J. Yule said there is. P. Amato asked if the stone  
121 wall is in the ROW? L. Daley thinks the stone wall is where the ROW starts and asked if the driveway  
122 could be straightened out to make is safer. J. Yule can ask but thinks the applicant will be resistant. L.  
123 Daley showed the submitted plan to create the two condos and the parking area angles down and  
124 potentially could have cars in the ROW. J. Yule said this same situation is next door, they park the same  
125 way. D. Knott indicated the neighbor is not here with an application before the Planning Board.

126  
127 S. Robinson asked if the parking would be better if the spaces were striped? J. Yule said a visual  
128 indicator for parking would help but there are no guarantees. Four parking spaces can be proposed and  
129 striped, with cross hatching in the other area to indicate no parking. L. Daley does not think painting and  
130 marking parking in a residential area on a scenic road should be considered.

131  
132 D. Knott asked if this would be a parking violation? L. Daley answered yes it is, one cannot park in the  
133 town ROW. D. Knott said that is the result of the configuration of the parking. P. Amato said it looks  
134 like the cars can be outside of the ROW; this works as a condo because it does not change the  
135 neighborhood, but by striping the parking, that would change the neighborhood. There is enough parking  
136 for two units, it is not ideal but it is not a deal breaker. P. Amato asked about the condo documents. L.  
137 Daley received the revised documents this evening but he has not reviewed them yet. He can work with  
138 the applicant to finalize those, noting that the Assessor commented that a floor plan for the condominiums  
139 should be provided as part of the condo docs. J. Yule asked if that is required and if so why? D. Knott  
140 said if it is not required, why would the Assessor be stating that it must be provided? L. Daley said it is  
141 the Assessor's preference because typically the floor plan is provided with the condo documents. P.  
142 Amato asked if any of the floors are changing? J. Yule said not that he is aware of. P. Amato said if they  
143 do make any changes, they would need to get a building permit to make the change and the Assessor  
144 would find out that way.

145  
146 Seeing no other comments or questions from the Board, D. Knott opened the public portion of the  
147 meeting. L. Daley said he did not see any hands raised to speak. D. Knott closed the public portion of the  
148 meeting.

149  
150 P. Amato moved to conditionally approve the plan subject to the applicant finalizing the condo documents  
151 and if the dumpster is permanent that it needs to be screened as is required by town regulations. J.  
152 Langdell seconded. A poll was taken: S. Robinson yes; P. Amato yes; J. Langdell yes; T. Finan yes; P.  
153 Basiliere yes; D. Knott yes.

154  
155 **c. B33 Lordens Plaza, LLC (owner) and St. Mary's Bank (applicant) – Review for acceptance and**  
156 **consideration of final approval to subdivide a 1.12 acre area from the parent lot to create a lot**  
157 **designated for the bank building. The parcels are located at 586 Nashua Street in the Commercial**  
158 **zoning district. Tax Map 44, Lot 6.**

159  
160 P. Amato moved to accept this application for review. J. Langdell seconded. A poll was taken: P.  
161 Amato yes; J. Langdell yes; S. Robinson yes; T. Finan yes; P. Basiliere yes; D. Knott yes. Motion  
162 passed.

163  
164 J. Langdell moved no potential regional impact. P. Amato seconded. A poll was taken: S. Robinson yes;  
165 T. Finan yes; J. Langdell yes; P. Amato yes; P. Basiliere yes; D. Knott yes.

166

167 **d. B33 Lordens Plaza, LLC (owner) and St. Mary’s Bank (applicant) – Review for acceptance and**  
168 **consideration of final approval for a site plan to renovate the existing bank building on a newly**  
169 **subdivided parcel with an additional bank drive aisle and 182 square foot building expansion. The**  
170 **parcels are located at 586 Nashua Street in the Commercial zoning district. Tax Map 44, Lot 6.**  
171

172 P. Amato moved to accept this plan for review. P. Basiliere seconded. A poll was taken: P. Amato yes;  
173 P. Basiliere yes; T. Finan yes; S. Robinson yes; J. Langdell yes; D. Knott yes. Motion passed.  
174

175 J. Langdell moved no potential regional impact. T. Finan seconded. A poll was taken; P. Amato yes; J.  
176 Langdell yes; P. Basiliere yes; S. Robinson yes; T. Finan yes; D. Knott yes. Motion passed.  
177

178 P. Basiliere excused himself from this meeting at this point to attend a School Board meeting being held  
179 at the same time, 7:20 p.m.  
180

181 The two applications for St. Mary’s Bank (subdivision and site plan) will be heard together this evening.  
182 D. MacGuire, representing the applicant explained the applicant is subdividing a portion of the parcel  
183 from the Lordens Plaza and renovating the building to accommodate St. Mary’s Bank. The plans being  
184 discussed were presented, they are looking to have separate ownership of the subdivided parcel. That  
185 smaller lot will go down the existing parking lot but the site lay out will be modified in the site plan. The  
186 application is proposed to close in the space at the entrance and add another drive through. There will  
187 also be an overall reduction in parking. Some of the pavement will be removed as well. The applicant is  
188 looking to replace the existing concrete curbing with granite curbing and refurbish the sidewalk. Even  
189 though it is a redevelopment of a similar use, it will look very different. D. MacGuire indicated there are  
190 some existing trees, one of the trees was overtaking the front of the building and will be removed; and  
191 there will be trees added. A couple of existing trees will be kept and landscaping will be spruced up and  
192 freshened up. All of the requirements are needed according to the regulations. We are holding on to the  
193 pole locations but adding another light fixture near the drive through lanes. The housing on the existing  
194 poles will be upgraded with new lighting.  
195

196 D. Knott asked about traffic flow; his concern is where the snow will be stored. D. MacGuire responded  
197 the easements and the shared access addresses those types of items. There is plenty of storage on the site  
198 for snow. He thinks both owners will do what makes sense. D. Knott thinks snow storage might be a  
199 nightmare, so he wanted to ask. D. Knott indicated that the Burning Bush should be removed, but wants  
200 it noted that the species is invasive and there are procedures to remove anything on the invasive species  
201 list. D. MacGuire said that was brought up with L. Daley and he can add a note to the landscaping plan.  
202 D. Knott saw on the plan that organic pesticides will be used – noting that the owner should be aware of  
203 that. P. McHugh, owner, is aware of that. J. Langdell asked what “pull out of Cam” means? D. Knott  
204 responded that stands for Commercial Area Maintenance, usually it is done to save money but it can  
205 cause trouble. J. Langdell thanked D. Knott for that information. J. Langdell said once this gets  
206 subdivided, how much parking is left (once this is cut off of the master parcel)? D. MacGuire answered  
207 since these are existing uses, we just calculate for this application, if other lots are than subdivided, the  
208 calculations will be run. J. Langdell asked L. Daley what those calculations are? L. Daley did not have  
209 those numbers available. D. MacGuire said over 30% of the required open space is available. P. Amato  
210 asked about drainage. D. MacGuire said they have the flow patterns and catch basins on the property and  
211 they are directed on site. That drainage was looked at and the water is collected and then goes into  
212 additional catch basins and disbursed to additional basins and go to a storm water treatment pond. There  
213 will be easements for that type of use as well as for parking. The easement documents will call that out.  
214

215 J. Langdell asked if there is going to be shared parking in the easement documents? P. McHugh said that  
216 is correct, for parking and drainage. J. Langdell asked if there will also be ownership listed? D.  
217 MacGuire said it will identify access, utilities, parking, easements for both St. Mary’s Bank and B33  
218 Lordens Plaza and they are working together on this. That needs final review by town staff. L. Daley  
219 asked about signage, will there be a sign on the monument sign or any wall signage? D. MacGuire would  
220 like to get appropriate signage, they are looking acquiring a monument sign, and that can be shown on the  
221 plan on the corner of the site and then wall signage but they will come in with those applications. L.  
222 Daley said that typically speaking, a sign plan should be given as part of the site plan application, would

223 the Planning Board want to see a sign plan or have staff work with the applicant on signage? J. Langdell  
224 said this is a separate lot so could they have a separate monument sign? L. Daley responded that they  
225 could. D. MacGuire said the Lorden Plaza sign is in a different category than this monument sign, where  
226 this building is much closer to Route 101A. J. Langdell is concerned about the sign density. P. Amato  
227 would like them to consider a wall sign for the bank instead of another monument sign. L. Daley  
228 indicated under the Town Ordinance, the maximum sign is 120 sf and the property can only have one  
229 monument sign. This is an opportunity to modify that monument sign and include the bank in it. D.  
230 MacGuire indicated that the intent was to maintain the existing monument sign on the Lordons Plaza lot  
231 and have a separate monument sign for the St. Mary's Bank on that lot. D. Knott feels like the Board is  
232 being asked to waive a requirement. A lot of work was put into the sign ordinance and we are being  
233 asked to waive it. L. Daley feels they will adhere to the ordinance or ask for relief. P. Amato would  
234 rather them come back to the Planning Board because of the nuances of this application.

235  
236 S. Robinson said having a sign only on the bank would not be acceptable. D. MacGuire said they would  
237 like to exercise their right to have a monument sign on the bank lot and meet those requirements. There  
238 are a couple of options, there could be a condition that any signage would need to go back to the Planning  
239 Board. J. Langdell said there could be a condition that the applicant come back to the Planning Board  
240 with the sign package for review. L. Daley asked about any sidewalks for this site plan? D. MacGuire  
241 said this is actually just to clean up the site, we did not propose sidewalks beyond what is there already.  
242 L. Daley asked if there will be any sidewalk contribution made for the Nashua Street sidewalk project? J.  
243 Langdell said the pedestrian sidewalk crossing was part of the Nashua Street sidewalk project; the Board  
244 wanted to see a pedestrian crossing near McDonald's. L. Daley agreed. P. Amato said it is not applicable  
245 for this application. L. Daley said with easements that are required for this include stormwater, it is his  
246 recommendation which was in his staff review. P. Amato asked if the regulations changed from what is  
247 there now, since it seems to be working. L. Daley said nothing is really changing on this plan, just the  
248 ownership, and they cannot discharge to an abutting property without easements. D. MacGuire said they  
249 are reducing the impervious area that allows for the bypass lane so we are reducing that. J. Langdell  
250 asked how many spaces are being removed? D. MacGuire said 7 spaces will be removed, those 7 spaces  
251 should not have been there to begin with, when we have drive-through lanes, you do not want to have cars  
252 backing into the drive through lanes. J. Langdell said those spaces would have been counted in the  
253 calculation for when the other strip mall was added. P. Amato says those 7 spaces could have been for  
254 employee parking so they would not park where customers park. D. MacGuire said the employee spaces  
255 allocated were many more than what was required. We could keep a few and mark them for employees  
256 only. P. Amato would like to see the calculations for that plaza to make sure they were not part of that.  
257 D. MacGuire could do a calculation for the uses in the plaza to see what is required.

258  
259 J. Langdell wants to make sure they will still meet the requirements for that area. L. Daley said as part of  
260 the sign package, the applicant could verify the parking calculations. D. Knott agreed that should get  
261 done.

262  
263 D. MacGuire continued by stating a dumpster will not be used on the site; they are not proposing a  
264 dumpster, they have people come in and take the waste with them so there is no need for an on-site  
265 dumpster. J. Langdell asked if St. Mary's will have more space inside the building? D. MacGuire was  
266 not sure on that. Bob McHugh responded that the first floor has 5000 sf existing and this building will  
267 expand the entrance by just under 1000 sf, so the building will have 6000 sf total. P. Amato asked for  
268 architectural. Kurt, architect, provided he design and said they are hoping to be moved in by September  
269 or October 2021. P. Amato said it is great the bank is moving across the street.

270  
271 Seeing no further input from the Board, D. Knott opened the meeting to the public. L. Daley did not see  
272 anyone waiting in the waiting room to speak. D. Knott closed the public portion. L. Daley indicated the  
273 easement documents have not been submitted to the town as of this date. P. Amato asked if they have  
274 been seen by Town Counsel? L. Daley answered they have not; noting that the monumentation for the  
275 subdivision also needs to be added to the plan or a bond needs to be set up for that. The outstanding items  
276 that need to be addressed prior to the applicant coming back to the Planning Board include: 1)  
277 clarification on the parking requirements; 2) a sign package for the Planning Board to review and  
278 approve; 3) monumentation be on the subdivision plan. L. Daley indicated the Subdivision Plan note the

279 monumentation on the plan or a security be submitted to cover the cost of monumentation to be provided  
280 by the applicant. The easements should be on the site plan as well. D. MacGuire said yes, we do not  
281 have the physical bounds yet, there is a list of covenants and cross easements that will benefit both  
282 properties, the Site Plan might be better to put those under. L. Daley said the applicant submitted both a  
283 Subdivision Plan application and a Site Plan application and those should be covered by both. P. Amato  
284 said if the monumentation was part of the Subdivision Plan, the Planning Board could move forward with  
285 that and then allow everything else to be on the Site Plan? J. Langdell said because of the parking, the  
286 Subdivision Plan is affected. L. Daley suggested putting the monumentation and easements through on  
287 the Site Plan application, that would allow the Subdivision to move forward tonight and then when they  
288 come back to the Planning Board and it would only be the Site Plan left to consider. P. Amato asked if  
289 the Subdivision Plan meets Town requirements? L. Daley said that it does, both lots meet the minimum  
290 size and frontage for conforming lots.

291  
292 D. MacGuire indicated there are 67 parking spaces on the remainder of that portion of the property and  
293 that building is 18,000 sf of retail. J. Langdell would rather wait until the number can be verified with an  
294 approved site plan instead of using what is in front of him. D. MacGuire will have that parking  
295 calculation when the applicant comes back with the sign package.

296  
297 P Amato moved to approve the Subdivision Plan with the condition that a note be added for  
298 monumentation as L. Daley has requested. T. Finan seconded. A poll was taken: J. Langdell yes; S.  
299 Robinson yes; P. Amato yes; T. Finan yes; D. Knott yes. Motion passed.

300  
301 P. Amato moved to conditionally approve the Site Plan with the applicant coming back for drainage,  
302 parking, a sign package and easement documents at the February 18, 2021 Planning Board meeting. T.  
303 Finan seconded. A poll was taken: S. Robinson yes; J. Langdell yes; T. Finan yes; P. Amato yes; D.  
304 Knott yes. Motion passed.

305  
306 L. Daley confirmed that the next Planning Board meeting for the applicant to come back will be February  
307 18, 2021, asking if the applicant can be prepared for that date. D. MacGuire responded that he can be.

308  
309 **e. Zachary Clark (applicant/owner) – Review for acceptance and consideration of final approval for a**  
310 **site plan and conditional use permit to construct a 1,300 square foot building to be used as a home**  
311 **industry based business. The parcel is located at 557 Route 13 South in the Residential R zoning**  
312 **district. Tax Map 47, Lot 39.**

313  
314 L. Daley indicated that Zachary Clark has requested his application to be heard at the February 2, 2021  
315 Planning Board meeting. A motion was taken prior to any applications being heard this evening.

316  
317 **f. In accordance with the requirements of NH RSA 675:3 the Milford Planning Board will hold a**  
318 **Public Hearing on Tuesday January 5, 2021 and January 19, 2021 beginning at 6:30 pm via Zoom.**  
319 **The purpose of the public hearing is to discuss the proposed amendments to the Town of Milford**  
320 **Zoning Ordinance as follows:**

321 a. Amend Article V, Sections 5.02.5 Yard Requirements, 5.03.6 Yard Requirements, and 5.04.5  
322 Yard Requirements by deleting Subsection C in each relative to accessory structures in the  
323 Residential A, B and R Zoning Districts.

324  
325 L. Daley explained the background information and history of the yard setbacks; the 6' setback  
326 originally in 1996 was to work with individuals to locate sheds in the Residence A district only  
327 because of the smaller lot sizes. In 2011, this expanded to all districts A, B and R. With this  
328 proposed modification, we are trying to be consistent in the town. In order to go into the 15'  
329 setback there is a zoning tool, the Special Exception, which would allow an accessory structure  
330 within the 15' setback. L. Daley explained Milford is unique with dimensional setbacks, so that  
331 abutters can co-exist. P. Amato said the Planning Board should take a look at the building  
332 envelopes on lots, he feels this is too restrictive. J. Langdell indicated there are incentives to help  
333 work with developers for better building envelopes to allow for family growth with these smaller  
334 lots. L. Daley said a number of great points are being brought up with this discussion. P. Amato

335 said we need to build nice neighborhoods instead of trying to get more housing on a plan. D.  
336 Knott opened the meeting to the public. L. Daley did not see anyone waiting to speak. D. Knott  
337 closed the public portion of the meeting. J. Langdell moved to post and publish the zoning  
338 amendment for Article V, Sections 5.02.5 Yard Requirements, 5.03.6 Yard Requirements and  
339 5.04.6 Yard Requirements. T. Finan seconded. A poll was taken: S. Robinson yes; P. Amato  
340 yes; T. Finan yes; J. Langdell yes; D. Knott yes. Motion passed.

- 341  
342 b. Amend Article VII, Supplementary Standards by inserting new Section 7.15 Mobile Food  
343 Vendors to regulate and accommodate mobile food vendors in appropriate locations.

344  
345 L. Daley provided updates to the proposed language of this proposed amendment; clarifying that  
346 this is not applicable to the “mobile canteen trucks” that often visit the Industrial businesses. This  
347 is regarding Mobile Food Vendors, there were no other comments. D. Knott opened the meeting  
348 to the public for comment. L. Daley did not see anyone waiting to speak. D. Knott closed the  
349 meeting to the public. J. Langdell moved to post and publish the zoning amendment Article VII  
350 for a new Section 7.15 Mobile Food Vendors. T. Finan seconded. A poll was taken: P. Amato  
351 yes; J. Langdell yes; T. Finan yes; S. Robinson yes; D. Knott yes. Motion passed.

352  
353 **3. Other Business:**

- 354  
355 **4. Approval of Minutes:** There were no minutes presented this evening.

- 356 **5. Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 9:01 p.m. on a motion made by T. Finan and seconded by S.  
357 Robinson. A poll was taken: T. Finan yes; P. Amato, yes; J. Langdell, yes; S. Robinson, yes; D. Knott, yes.  
358 Motion passed. The next Planning Board meeting is February 2, 2021.

359  
360  
361  
362 \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
363 Signature of the Chairperson/Vice-Chairperson:

364  
365 **MINUTES OF THE 1/19/21 MEETING WERE APPROVED**  
366 \_\_\_\_\_