

Town of Franklin



Planning Board

**December 21, 2020
Meeting Minutes**

Chair Anthony Padula called the above-captioned **Remote Access Virtual Zoom Meeting** to order this date at 7:00 PM. Members in attendance: Joseph Halligan, William David, Gregory Rondeau, Rick Power, Associate member Jennifer Williams. Members absent: None. Also present: Michael Maglio, Town Engineer; Amy Love, Planner; Matthew Crowley, BETA Group, Inc.

*As stated on the agenda, due to the continued concerns regarding the COVID-19 virus, the Planning Board will conduct a **Remote Access Virtual Zoom Meeting**. The Massachusetts State of Emergency and the associated state legislation allows towns to hold remote access virtual meetings during the COVID-19 pandemic crisis. In an effort to ensure citizen engagement and comply with open meeting law regulations, citizens will be able to dial into the meeting using the provided phone number, or citizens can participate by using the Zoom link also provided on the agenda.*

7:00 PM **Commencement/General Business**

Chair Padula read aloud the Zoom platform call-in phone number and the Zoom link which were also provided on the meeting agenda.

A. Road Acceptance: Lucinda Way

The Planning Board discussed recommending the roadway acceptance to Town Council.

Motion to recommend Road Acceptance for Lucinda Way to Town Council. Halligan. Second: David. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

B. Bond Release: Sandy Knoll Estates

The Planning Board discussed releasing the remaining amount of the Bond being held for Sandy Knoll Estates. Ms. Love stated there is \$10,000 remaining in Bond money being held until the Town Council accepts the Roadway.

Motion to Approve Bond Release: Sandy Knoll Estates. Halligan. Second: Rondeau. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

C. Decision: 72-94 East Central Street- Special Permit & Site Plan

Chair Padula recused himself.

Ms. Love stated the applicant is requesting two waivers, and there are two suggested special conditions.

Vice Chair Halligan read aloud the following two special conditions:

1. Prior to issuance of the occupancy permits for the final two (2) residential units within the building to be located at 94 East Central Street, the applicant shall have completed the exterior renovations/additions to

the building located at 88 East Central Street, and said structure is weather tight and built according to exterior plan, to the satisfaction of the Building Commissioner.

2. This special permit is personal to this applicant, or an entity owned by the applicant, and shall NOT run with land; any proposed change in the project, including a change of ownership, shall require submittal to and approval by Franklin Planning Board.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

This determination shall be in addition to the following specific findings:

1. **Special Permits VOTE:** §185 Attachment 9: Maximum Height of Building and §185 Attachment 7: Multifamily.

Vice Chair Halligan read aloud the following.

- a) Proposed project addresses or is consistent with neighbor or Town need.
Halligan-YES; David-NO; Power-YES; Rondeau-NO. Vote: 2-2 (2-Yes; 2-No)
- b) Vehicular traffic flow, access and parking and pedestrian safety are properly addressed.
Halligan-YES; David-YES; Power-YES; Rondeau-YES. Vote: 4-0 (4-Yes; 0-No)
- c) Public roadways, drainage, utilities and other infrastructure are adequate or will be upgraded to accommodate development.
Halligan-YES; David-YES; Power-YES; Rondeau-YES. Vote: 4-0 (4-Yes; 0-No)
- d) Neighborhood character and social structure will not be negatively impacted.
Halligan-YES; David-NO; Power-YES; Rondeau-NO. Vote: 2-2 (2-Yes; 2-No)
- e) Project will not destroy or cause substantial damage to any environmentally significant natural resource, habitat, or feature or, if it will, proposed mitigation, remediation, replication or compensatory measures are adequate.
Halligan-YES; David-YES; Power-YES; Rondeau-YES. Vote: 4-0 (4-Yes; 0-No)
- f) Number, height, bulk, location and siting of building(s) and structures(s) will not result in abutting properties being deprived of light or fresh air circulation or being exposed to flooding or subjected to excessive noise, odor, light, vibrations, or airborne particulates.
Halligan-YES; David-NO; Power-YES; Rondeau-NO. Vote: 2-2 (2-Yes; 2-No)
- g) Water consumption and sewer use taking into consideration current and projected future local water supply and demand and wastewater treatment capacity, will not be excessive.
Halligan-YES; David-YES; Power-YES; Rondeau-YES. Vote: 4-0 (4-Yes; 0-No)

The proposed use will not have adverse effects which overbalance its beneficial effects on either the neighborhood or the Town, in view of the particular characteristics of the site and of the proposal in relation to that site.

Halligan-YES; David-NO; Power-YES; Rondeau-NO. Vote: 2-2 (2-Yes; 2-No)

Ms. Love stated the applicant needed a majority vote for this to pass and there is a 2-2 vote; the project fails. She stated there were no reasons given on the no votes. Vice Chair Halligan stated he sees no reason to vote on the waivers as it is not a viable project.

Chair Padula re-entered the meeting.

D. Phasing Plan Approval: 160 Grove Street

Ms. Love reviewed that the applicant proposed a phasing plan at the November 16, 2020 meeting. The plan proposed was not the correct plan and the applicant has since submitted a revised Phase Plan One. Included in the Planning Board's meeting packet is a memo from the applicant outlining the phasing plan along with a detailed Site Plan of Phase One. The applicant is looking for agreement from the Planning Board to allow the Phase Plan. She stated the applicant is proposing about 56 parking spots in the front parking area in Phase One and the back parking area in Phase Two. Chair Padula asked about the back area and if a fire truck could get around. Ms. Love stated the applicant will have access around the entire building in Phase One. Mr. Rondeau asked about the duration between the phases. Ms. Love stated the applicant could not provide a timeline; it will depend on how well their product sells and their finances. Chair Padula read aloud the applicant's contingency plan provided in the application.

Motion to Approve the Phasing Plan for 160 Grove Street. No motion/No second made. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

E. Endorsement: 164 Grove Street

Ms. Love reviewed that the Planning Board approved the Site Plan and Special Permits on November 2, 2020 for 164 Grove Street, Marijuana Retail. The applicant has added the Certificate of Vote to the Site Plan. As a Special Condition, the Planning Board requested that easements for the access driveway be provided prior to endorsement; the draft easements have been attached. Chair Padula requested the information be put on the front of the plans. Mr. Rondeau asked if all the paperwork is in for the light at Grove Street and Washington Street. Ms. Love stated there were no conditions in the Certificate of Vote for paperwork. She stated there was a resolution made by the Town Council. Mr. Rondeau stated he wants to make sure the light is taken care of.

Mr. Maglio provided an update and stated the Town did not get the Mass Works Grant, but the Town is moving forward on the project. The Town Council authorized a borrowing resolution to fund the project. They are working now to get a survey done and hiring an engineer to design it. They will apply for the Mass Works grant again next year.

Motion to Endorse 164 Grove Street. Rondeau. Second: David. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

F. Endorsement: 162 Grove Street

Ms. Love reviewed that the Planning Board approved the Site Plan and Special Permits on October 19, 2020 for 162 Grove Street, Marijuana Retail. The applicant has added the Certificate of Vote to the Site Plan. Chair Padula requested the special conditions be on the front page of the plans.

Motion to Endorse 162 Grove Street. David. Second: Rondeau. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

G. 81-P ANR: 15-17 Margaret's Cove

Ms. Love reviewed that the ANR plan depicts two conforming lots. The applicant is not adding a new buildable lot; the applicant is only increasing the size of existing lots within the subdivision. Each lot meets the zoning regulations. Chair Padula asked if this was a modification to the subdivision. Ms. Love stated that the applicant is not increasing the number of lots; no new lots are being added.

Motion to Approve 81-P ANR: 15-17 Margaret's Cove. Rondeau. Second: David. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

H. 81-P ANR Rescind Vote: 55 Coutu Street

Chair Padula explained the Planning Board approved an 81-P ANR plan for 55 Coutu Street with conditions. However, the 81-P ANR cannot be subject to such conditions. Per Town Attorney Cerel, it is recommended

that the Planning Board rescind their vote on the 81-P ANR application as such conditions are not permitted in an 81-P ANR application. He stated the applicant will file a Definitive Subdivision Modification with the Planning Board.

Motion to Rescind Vote for 81-P ANR: 55 Coutu Street. Halligan. Second: Rondeau. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

I. Meeting Minutes: November 2, 2020 & November 16, 2020

Motion to Approve the Meeting Minutes for November 2, 2020. Rondeau. Second: David. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Motion to Approve the Meeting Minutes for November 16, 2020. Rondeau. Second: David. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

7:05 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – *Continued*
52 East Central Street
 Special Permit & Site Plan Modification
Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.
WITHDRAWN

Ms. Love reviewed the concerns expressed by the Planning Board at their last meeting. She stated the applicant is withdrawing their special permit request for a drive through at the existing gas station. The applicant is now requesting a takeout coffee shop with no drive through.

Mr. Halim Choubah, consulting engineer representing the applicant, stated they had appeared before the Planning Board regarding a special permit for a drive through coffee shop at the existing gas station. The Planning Board members expressed concerns. The applicant looked at all their options regarding traffic circulation; unfortunately, it did not work. They have decided to withdraw their special permit request for a drive through. However, they would like to explore the possibility of having a 600 sq. ft. coffee shop at the location. He stated it is an allowed use, and five parking spaces would be required; they have 10 parking spaces on the site. He asked what is expected from the applicant as they will not be doing any site modification.

Chair Padula stated that procedurally, the applicant would withdraw their application without prejudice. As long as they stay under 600 sq. ft., it is the building commissioner's call as to how much they can change on the site.

Mr. Choubah stated he wished to withdraw the application without prejudice for the Special Permit & Site Plan Modification.

Motion to Withdraw the application without prejudice for 52 East Central Street, Special Permit & Site Plan Modification. Halligan. Second: Power. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

7:10 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – *Continued*
515 West Central Street
 Site Plan
Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.
TO BE CONTINUED

Ms. Amanda Cavaliere of Guerriere & Halnon, Inc. stated that on behalf of the applicant a letter requesting a continuance to the next meeting was submitted.

Motion to Continue the public hearing for 515 West Central Street, Site Plan, to January 11, 2021, at 7:10 PM. David. Second: Rondeau. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

7:15 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – *Initial*
 138 East Central Street
 Site Plan
 Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.

Motion to Waive the reading. Rondeau. Second: David. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Mr. Halligan recused himself.

Mr. Rick Goodreau of United Consultants, Inc., on behalf of the Franklin Food Pantry, owner of the property, stated members of the Franklin Food Pantry would like to make a presentation; he will then review the Site Plan.

Ms. Lynn Calling, Executive Director of the Franklin Food Pantry, narrated a slideshow presentation. She provided their mission and vision and an overview of the Franklin Food Pantry. She stated they are essential to Franklin. She explained why they need a building. She noted their vision for 138 East Central Street.

Mr. Goodreau reviewed the Site Plan. He stated that the rear of the property has access off Cross Street. The site currently consists of an existing building. The majority of the property is currently paved with access from East Central Street. The site will be reconfigured to provide vehicle parking, vehicle access, and pedestrian access. The plan includes access with a one-way entrance on East Central Street. He reviewed the number and location of parking spaces. He explained the one-way exit on Cross Street. He reviewed the dumpster location, dumpster pick up procedure, and the off-loading area in parking space #13 for the food pantry truck deliveries. He explained the pedestrian access to the site and the proposed pedestrian walkway as shown on the plans. He reviewed site grading, utilities, and plantings. He stated they have had meetings with the Town's technical review staff. He reviewed the proposed stormwater plan. He stated that during the review process, BETA determined that this site was party to an activity and use limitation. While it is a possibly to provide a stormwater system on the site, any excavation greater than four feet would be at the purview of a licensed site professional. He stated a photometric plan has been provided. BETA provided a comment regarding the property to the southwest. The applicant is proposing to remove existing vegetation in the area and install a 4 ft. fence; BETA suggested increasing the fence height to 6 ft.

Mr. Rob Marcalow of Kuth Ranieri Architects reviewed the building aesthetics and site features. He showed existing site photos and proposed renderings. He stated that the footprint of the existing building will not be changed. He reviewed landscaping, access, office locations, and client entry.

Mr. and Mrs. William Martin, 33 Cross Street, abutters to the property, expressed concern about the proposed removal of the trees on the property line; they do not want their trees cut down. The trees provide privacy and a residential feel to their property.

Ms. Love reviewed her memorandum to the Planning Board dated December 17, 2020, provided in the meeting packet. She stated there is no Conservation jurisdiction on the site. The deputy fire chief had no concerns with the submitted Site Plan. The applicant has requested the \$1,500 application fee be waived. Chair Padula stated this is a regular Site Plan application; he does not see a reason to waive the fee.

Mr. Maglio reviewed his letter to the Planning Board dated December 7, 2020. He stated that where this is a redevelopment project, the applicant is proposing a net decrease in impervious area as well as infiltrating some of the existing roof runoff in order to meet the stormwater standards. He stated agreement with this approach and the proposed drainage improvements. He noted that the layout of parking space #1 may present

a safety concern as a vehicle parked in this spot would need to back up into the entrance driveway. He stated the plans call for an approximately 30 ft. length of vertical curb along the property line shared with the adjacent gas station near the front of the property on East Central Street. Where this area is currently all paved between the two parcels, the applicant may want to consider eliminating this curb line to avoid it from being hit and to simplify snow removal.

Ms. Williams asked about the van accessible parking space and stated that it seems like a potentially hazardous situation as it is a tight corner and space. She expressed concern regarding space #12 as well. Overall, it feels like there are a lot of entries and exists on the site with vehicles pulling in and out. In terms of the building itself, being in the character of the Town of Franklin, while the modern architecture is great, she is wondering about the color choice. Mr. Rondeau stated that he read in BETA's comments that five parking spaces are on the abutting property. He does not see snow storage on the plans. He expressed concerns about the dumpster location and noted that dumpster trucks now are front loading. There is a lot going on in a small site. Mr. Power asked on average how many people will occupy the food pantry at any one time. Ms. Calling said right now they are doing a drive through operation, and they have posted hours when people can come; they usually see 35 to 80 people. When people come into the pantry, appointments are scheduled. Mr. David asked for clarification about the entrance and exit. Mr. Goodreau reviewed the snow storage plan; they have plans to remove snow from the site due to the tightness of the site. Mr. Rondeau noted that as this is considered a tainted site, will they have to be concerned about snow being taken off the site if it could potentially be contaminated. Chair Padula provided a brief history of the site. It used to be a Chrysler-Dodge dealership; it is a contaminated site. He explained the site drainage. He stated that it abuts a residential property; the bylaw states there will be a space 4 ft. wide of screening. He expressed concern about parking space #10 and the dumpster procedure. He noted concern about the length of parking spaces #7, 8 and 9, and the turning capabilities of a vehicle. He noted the proposed 4 ft. high screening fence and stated that screening is to be 4 ft. wide. He stated it is a challenge to get this site onto this property. He stated the renderings are not to scale as the parking area looks huge and the cars look small. He stated they should try to have a conforming site before requesting waivers.

Mr. Crowley highlighted his letter to the Planning Board dated December 17, 2020, and noted concern about the overall function of the site as related to parking and vehicles being able to maneuver. He discussed waivers that will need to be requested. He noted light spillage over the property lines and existing contamination on the site.

Mr. and Mrs. Martin reiterated their concerns about privacy and the residential nature of their property. Mr. Martin stated that the trees proposed to be removed are on their side of the property line. Mrs. Martin stated that they had a survey done, and it is very clear where their property line is; they do not want the cedar trees cut down. Mr. Goodreau stated it would be a good idea if he and people from the food pantry met with the Martins on the site to review the Site Plan and look at the situation to see if a resolution can be determined. Chair Padula noted that with the 4 ft. wide requirement, the trees can be kept. He stated Mr. Goodreau would contact the Martins.

Chair Padula stated the Planning Board's concerns are public safety and infrastructure.

Mr. Sean Yang, 24 Cross Street, asked that with regard to this business, will there will be an odor. Ms. Sue Kilcoyne confirmed there will be no onsite food preparation or cooking. Mr. Yang stated there is a dumpster pickup at Walgreens that comes very early in the morning. He asked for the dumpster schedule of the food pantry. Chair Padula stated Mr. Yang should call the building commissioner as no dumpster pick up should be before 7 AM.

Mr. Jim Roche, Franklin Food Pantry Treasurer, clarified the reasoning for the fee waiver. He stated that they are a 501C charitable organization. He stated that 78 to 80 percent of funds raised go to serving the clientele.

Chair Padula asked if they only serve Franklin. Mr. Roche stated that in the pandemic environment they do not turn away anyone from the drive through. The majority of their clients are from Franklin.

Mr. Power stated he would be in favor of waiving the \$1,500 as it could go to helping a family. Mr. Rondeau and Mr. David agreed. Mr. David confirmed the drive through procedure due to the pandemic.

Motion to Waive the \$1,500 application fee for 138 East Central Street, Site Plan. Rondeau. Second: David. Vote: 4-0-0 (4-Yes; 0-No).

Motion to Continue the public hearing for 138 East Central Street, Site Plan, to January 25, 2021. Rondeau. Second: David. Vote: 4-0-0 (4-Yes; 0-No).

Mr. Halligan re-entered the meeting.

7:20 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – Initial
 Countryside Estates
 Subdivision Modification
 Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.

Motion to Waive the reading. Rondeau. Second: Power. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Ms. Love stated the requested modification is to eliminate the sidewalk on Countryside Lane. She noted the applicant still owes DPCD \$291.06 for the legal ad and abutters mailing.

Mr. Maglio stated that the submitted plan was reviewed, and he has no issue with the elimination of the sidewalk. He suggested that if the proposed sidewalk is eliminated, the Planning Board consider requiring the developer to donate the cost savings to the Town for sidewalk construction elsewhere in Town.

Mr. Justin Ruel, resident 6 Countryside Lane and applicant, explained the request to eliminate the sidewalk. He stated that Countryside Lane is a short street that ends in a cul de sac with only three private residences. The original plans called for one sidewalk on the southern side of the street. It was agreed with the residents and the developer in 2016 to move the sidewalk to the other side to minimize a septic slope. After incorrectly believing this sidewalk matter was addressed, this issue is that on one hand the developer is expected to deliver the sidewalk, while on the other hand he and his neighbors expected movement of the sidewalk to the northerly side of the street. Regardless, as the development is near completion, no resident on the street would like the sidewalk developed as it is detrimental to their properties. They hope the Planning Board will agree to allow the modification.

Chair Padula stated this is a continuous sidewalk from September Drive. As this subdivision got approved, the Planning Board already waived subdivision regulations to allow one sidewalk. It is a public sidewalk accepted by the Town; it is not privately owned. The Planning Board very seldom waives sidewalks. He stated that this developer knows that this sidewalk should have been installed before the subdivision got this far. He discussed that the developer has also not provided continuous concrete aprons. He noted that in the future, a current homeowner could sell their home and a handicapped person could move in who would need the sidewalk. Mr. Rondeau agreed with Chair Padula that the sidewalk should go in.

Mr. Ruel stated that as the developer did not do this when he was supposed to, the homeowners are now facing significant costs to modify their lots to compensate for something that was not done. Due to the sloping of their front yard, they may have to put in a retaining wall which would be an extraordinary cost. Chair Padula stated he believes the developer should incur that cost; he should make it right. Mr. Maglio stated he believes the slope is 3 to 1; therefore, the developer would have to incur that cost. Planning Board members discussed the subdivision regulations and the position of the neighbors. Ms. Love stated there is

about \$193,000 in the current bond being held. Chair Padula asked that Mr. Maglio or BETA get back to the developer to let them know what still needs to be done; the developer must take care of it.

Mr. Ruel stated he is concerned that if the Planning Board votes against their request, they will have to incur significant costs and retribution against the developer will be very difficult. Chair Padula asked Mr. Ruel to let the Town try to take care of this issue.

Motion to Close the public hearing for Countryside Estates, Subdivision Modification. Rondeau. Second: David. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Motion to Deny Countryside Estates, Subdivision Modification. Rondeau. Second: David. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

7:25 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – Continued
186 Grove Street
 Site Plan Modification
Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.

Ms. Love stated there were a few items Mr. Maglio and BETA wanted the applicant to add to the plans. They wanted the 200 ft. riverfront line added to the plans. Mr. Maglio stated his previous comment has been satisfied. Mr. Crowley stated his comments have been addressed. He noted a few items including that it should be indicated on the plan set that the concrete curbing should be precast, and the detail for the hay bales should be replaced with straw wattles. He noted that the applicant is requesting a waiver to not provide some trees around the parking area which he believes is reasonable.

Mr. Tim Power, applicant's engineer, stated there are a few waivers.

Motion to Close the public hearing for 186 Grove Street, Site Plan Modification. Halligan. Second: Rondeau. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Motion to Approve the Waiver: Section 185-31C.(3).(f) – Topography for Whole Site - Topography for the whole site is not warranted given the size and scale of the project. Topography is adequately provided within all areas where improvements are proposed, for 186 Grove Street, Site Plan Modification. Halligan. Second: David. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Motion to Approve the Waiver: Section 185-31C.(3).(l) – Photometric Plan - During the site plan review in 2019, a photometric was provided for the initial site construction that demonstrated the now existing light pole would not create glare or illumination that extended beyond the site's property lines. A second pole is now proposed further away from any property lines than the existing pole., for 186 Grove Street, Site Plan Modification. Halligan. Second: David. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Motion to Approve the Waiver: Section 185-21.C.(5) – Parking Lot Trees - No new trees are proposed as part of the project. The property and area surrounding the parking lot is well vegetated with woodland areas. No existing trees are to be removed as part of this project, for 186 Grove Street, Site Plan Modification. Halligan. Second: Rondeau. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Motion to Approve 186 Grove Street, Site Plan Modification. Rondeau. Second: David. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Meeting Comments

Ms. Love stated the Planning Board should revisit the General Business item for **Decision: 72-94 East Central Street- Special Permit & Site Plan**. She stated that if the Planning Board votes No on a Special Permit, the Planning Board must provide a reason. Four of the questions were voted No.

Vice Chair Halligan read aloud the following.

- a) Proposed project addresses or is consistent with neighbor or Town need.

Halligan-YES; David-NO; Power-YES; Rondeau-NO. Vote: 2-2 (2-Yes; 2-No)

Mr. David stated the building is too big for the site; there is too much going on there. Mr. Rondeau stated agreement with Mr. David and that the building is too large for the site; it is too congested.

- d) Neighborhood character and social structure will not be negatively impacted.

Halligan-YES; David-NO; Power-YES; Rondeau-NO. Vote: 2-2 (2-Yes; 2-No)

Mr. David stated the building being so big would be out of place; the home out front should be removed and bring the building forward to be consistent with the previous buildings. Mr. Rondeau stated agreement with Mr. David and that the size of the building has an effect on the neighbors as well.

- f) Number, height, bulk, location and siting of building(s) and structures(s) will not result in abutting properties being deprived of light or fresh air circulation or being exposed to flooding or subjected to excessive noise, odor, light, vibrations, or airborne particulates.

Halligan-YES; David-NO; Power-YES; Rondeau-NO. Vote: 2-2 (2-Yes; 2-No)

Mr. David stated that the building being so big where it sits and close to the lot lines, it will impact the structures around it being the size it is. Mr. Rondeau stated agreement with Mr. David and he was a proponent of the white house being removed and the building being pulled forward. It has a direct impact on the area.

The proposed use will not have adverse effects which overbalance its beneficial effects on either the neighborhood or the Town, in view of the particular characteristics of the site and of the proposal in relation to that site.

Halligan-YES; David-NO; Power-YES; Rondeau-NO. Vote: 2-2 (2-Yes; 2-No)

Mr. David stated they have asked for the home out front to be taken down and pull the building forward. Altering the existing home and adding an addition to it does not look proper to that area. Mr. Rondeau stated agreement with Mr. David and that he was a proponent of the building being pulled forward and making it aesthetically pleasing for the Town; it is too much for a small lot.

Chair Padula pointed out a procedural concern regarding Planning Board members providing extra reasons for the way they vote on Special Permits; in effect, they are providing a double reason as the question itself indicates the reason.

Motion to Adjourn the Remote Access Virtual Zoom Planning Board Meeting. Halligan. No Second. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No). Meeting adjourned at 9:06 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith Lizardi, Recording Secretary

******Planning Board approved at the January 25, 2021 meeting***