

**GROTON PLANNING BOARD****APRIL 3, 2003****MINUTES**

Vice Chairman Barringer called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM in the Town Hall

Members present: Barringer, Clements, Eliot, Lewis, Perkins and Wilson

Members absent: Degen

**PRE-SUBMISSION REVIEW – LOST LAKE FIRE STATION**

The Planning Board met with Fire Chief Joseph Bosselait, Brooks Lyman, Chairman of the Municipal Space Needs Committee, and design engineer Andrew Baum of David Ross Associates to discuss the submission of a site plan for the Lost Lake fire Station. Mr. Baum discussed the proposed 6758 sq ft, single-story addition to the existing Fire Station on Lost Lake Drive. The addition will provide two bays, a meeting room, office space, and dormitory area. As required in the Zoning By-law, 24 parking spaces are shown on the plan. The existing basketball court will be relocated to the rear of the site. The Zoning Board of Appeals will hold a public hearing on the special permit application on April 23, 2003.

Mr. Baum requested waivers of the traffic study, the development impact statement, and the scale model. He said he would like to eliminate required the median strip in the parking lot in order to save the mature pine trees. He also requested that Cape Cod berms be used instead of granite curbs.

*(Member Wilson arrived.)*

Member Lewis asked if there are problems with drainage and runoff at this site. Mr. Baum said a catch basin would be installed for the access road and parking lot. Member Lewis said he would prefer a natural berm rather than Cape Cod berms. Mr. Baum said the berm is required to comply with the total suspended solids requirements of the Stormwater Management provisions. In addition, erosion problems would result if berms were not installed. Member Lewis said if Cape Cod berms were used they would not last because the plows will destroy them.

Member Lewis asked about lighting. Mr. Baum said lighting fixtures would be on the buildings. Floodlights will be used when the Fire Department is called out. Chief Bosselait said only security lighting would be used unless there is a call.

Member Perkins asked how much cut and fill is needed to relocate the basketball court. Mr. Baum said the new basketball court would be almost at existing grade.

Member Perkins said the parking spaces should not be located so that cars must back out into the road. She asked if the spaces near Lost Lake Drive could be moved to the rear of the site. Mr. Baum said, "yes."

Mr. Lyman said the parking lot in the rear is for meetings and training. The spaces near Lost Lake Drive are for daytime visitors. Member Lewis agreed that parking should not be near the entrance.

Member Perkins asked where the spaces for disabled people would be located. Mr. Baum said, "near the rear door."

Member Wilson agreed that the parking spaces near the entrance should be relocated to the rear of the site. Member Wilson asked if it is essential that the basketball court be moved. Mr. Lyman said, "yes," the basketball court must remain on the site. However, the Committee is investigating alternatives.

Vice Chairman Barringer said the applicant should submit a written list of the requested waivers. In addition, a photometric diagram is required.

The Board will walk the site on Saturday, April 12, 2003 at 8:00 AM.

**PUBLIC HEARING – PROPOSED ZONING AMENDMENTS**

In accordance with the provisions of Chapter 40A, § 5, M. G. L., the Groton Planning Board held a public hearing on Thursday, April 3, 2003 at 7:30 PM in the Town Hall, 173 Main Street (second floor meeting room), to consider the following proposed zoning amendments:

1. To see if the town will vote to amend Chapter 218, Zoning, of the Code of the Town of Groton by deleting existing section 218-30 Water Resource Protection Districts in its entirety, and by substituting the a new section 218-30 Water Resource Protection Districts, the text of which is on file in the Office of the Town Clerk.
2. To see if the town will vote to amend Chapter 218, Zoning, of the Code of the Town of Groton by deleting existing section 218-26 Open Space Residential Development in its entirety and by making the following changes regarding new section 218.26:

Item 1. Add a new Section 218-26, entitled Flexible Development, the text of which is on file in the Office of the Town Clerk.

Item 2. Add the following new definition to Section 218-4:

TRANSFER LOT - A parcel of land with not less than 80,000 square feet used to establish a density bonus in a Flexible Development, as set forth in section 218-26. Such Transfer Lot shall be (1) determined by the Planning Board to be of special importance because of its visual prominence or potential vista blockage, ecological significance or fragility, value as agricultural or recreational land, critical relation or proximity to the Town's drinking water supply, or because it is identified in the Town's open space plan; (2) not wetlands, as defined in G.L. c. 131, s. 40, or not land used to satisfy dimensional requirements in any other development of land; (3) subject to a permanent conservation restriction pursuant to G.L.. 184, ss. 31-33, or conveyed to the Town, or conveyed to a nonprofit organization, the principal purpose of which is the conservation of open space or other appropriate purpose.

Item 3. Delete from Section 218-13, the Schedule of Use Regulations, the entry "Flexible development or cluster development as allowed under the provisions of s. 218-26" and substitute therefor:

Flexible Development pursuant to s. 218-26	PB	N	N	N	N	N	N
---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---

Item 4. Delete, in Section 218-20, Schedule of Intensity Regulations, note 1, the words "For cluster development, see s. 218-26F(2)."

3. To see if the town will vote to amend Chapter 218, Zoning, of the Code of the Town of Groton by deleting existing section 218-26.1 Major Residential Development and by making the following changes regarding new section 218-26.1, entitled Major Residential Development:

Item 1. Add a new section 218-26.1, entitled Major Residential Development, the text of which is on file in the Office of the Town Clerk.

Item 2. Delete the definition of major residential development from section 218-4.

Item 3. Add the following note 4 to section 218-20, the schedule of intensity regulations, attaching such note to the frontage requirement in the R-A and R-B Districts:

<sup>4</sup>lots shown on a residential compound plan endorsed by the planning board pursuant to the subdivision control law, may, upon the grant of a special permit by the planning board, reduce lot frontage to fifty (50) feet.

Item 4. In section 218-23.d, delete the entire sentence after the words "no more than ....." and substitute the words

“two lots”.

4. To see if the town will vote to amend Chapter 218, Zoning, of the Code of the Town of Groton by deleting existing section 218-28 Development Rate Limitation and by substituting the new Section 218-28 Rate of Development and 218-28.1 Subdivision Phasing, the text of which is on file in the Office of the Town Clerk.

5. To see if the town will vote to amend Chapter 218, Zoning, of the Code of the Town of Groton to add a new district, entitled Open Space - Agricultural (OS-A) district, as follows:

Item 1. Add the following entry to section 218-8.d:

(4) OS-A Open Space - Agricultural District

Item 2. Add the following to section 218-12:

g. P Public Use District is intended to regulate land in public use or land with public facilities.

h. OS-A Open Space-Agricultural District is intended to regulate parcels within the town permanently restricted pursuant to G.L. c. 134, ss. 31-33, so that such parcels may be assessed and taxed at a uniform rate most advantageous to the owners thereof. No parcel shall be included within the OS-A District unless such permanent restriction pursuant to statute shall be first verified by town counsel. Uses allowed in the district shall be those consistent with such permanent restriction.

6. To see if the town will vote to amend Chapter 218, Zoning, of the Code of the Town of Groton by adding a new section 218-30.2, entitled Scenic Road Overlay District, the text of which is on file in the Office of the Town Clerk.

7. To see if the town will vote to amend Chapter 218, Zoning, of the Code of the Town of Groton by amending section 218-9 Location of Districts by deleting “Town of Groton, Massachusetts – Zoning Map, dated March 1, 1998, and by substituting, “Town of Groton, Massachusetts – Zoning Map, dated March 10, 2003,” a copy of which is on file in the Office of the Town Clerk.

Vice Chairman Barringer called the public hearing to order. Clerk Wilson read the notice published in the March 19 and 26, 2003 issues of the Groton Landmark and March 21 and 28, 2003 issues of the Groton Herald. The Board’s consultant, Attorney Mark Bobrowski, was present.

### **Water Resource Protection Districts**

Attorney Bobrowski explained that the new map conforms to the Department of Environmental Protection’s (DEP) Zone I (well field), Zone II (groundwater recharge area) and Zone III (watershed area). Zone I is held in public ownership as required in the DEP’s public water supply regulations. Zones II and III are shown on the map and referenced in the proposed revisions to the Water Resource Protection Districts. The changes in the new provisions include designating the Planning Board rather than the ZBA as special permit granting authority and the addition of performance standards.

John Diezemann asked about changes to the map. Planning Administrator Michelle Collette said the proposed map is based upon the MassGIS map of Zones I, II, and III and used contours as the boundary lines. The original map, adopted in 1984, was based upon property lines, roads, and streams to simplify administration.

Dr. William Eger asked about the district changes around Lost Lake. He said there are many two-family houses in the district today. Attorney Bobrowski said the two-family houses are existing, non-conforming structures. Planning Administrator Michelle Collette said the provisions for single-family residential use by-right based upon the amount of sewage generated per lot area has been in the WRPD since 1984.

Dr. Eger asked about the lake itself. Attorney Bobrowski said the by-law regulates the shoreline and land-based activities.

Dr. Eger asked about fuel storage tanks. Attorney Bobrowski said above-ground tanks are allowed in the WRPD.

Paul Fitzgerald asked if homeowners could still drill wells if earth removal is prohibited. Attorney Bobrowski said the WRPD refers to earth removal as defined by the Earth Removal By-law. Drilling wells is not earth removal.

Mr. Diezemann asked about the new definitions and the use of pesticides. Attorney Bobrowski said the Wendell Case (Town of Wendell v. Attorney General of Massachusetts, 1985) states that the regulation of pesticides is outside the scope of municipalities.

Mr. Fitzgerald asked about very small quantity generators of hazardous waste. Vice Chairman Barringer said small quantity generators are defined in state laws as entities that generate less than 50 gallons in three months.

Carrie Kneeland asked about underground storage tanks. Vice Chairman Barringer said existing tanks are grandfathered and new underground tanks cannot be installed in a Zone II today and requires a special permit in Zone III.

### **Flexible Development**

Attorney Bobrowski explained that the proposed Flexible Development by-law replaces the existing Open Space Residential Development with new provisions that will have the greatest degree of flexibility under the control of the Planning Board as the Special Permit Granting Authority. He said the steps in developed land under the new Flexible Development provisions are as follows:

- Evaluate the land and identify the natural resources;
- Determine the yield plan based upon a conventional plan;
- Determine density bonuses, up to 40%, with all density units being limited to two bedrooms;
- Locate roads and infrastructure based upon the Subdivision Regulations.

Member Clements asked if TDR's could be used at a 2:1 ratio. Attorney Bobrowski said, "yes," because the units built using TDR's are limited to two bedrooms. Member Clements asked how this would be tracked. Attorney Bobrowski said the Building Inspector is the Zoning Enforcement Officer and must keep track of the special permit requirements.

Member Perkins asked if the new provisions replace § 218-26 Open Space Residential Development in its entirety. Attorney Bobrowski said, "yes."

Brooks Lyman of the Groton Housing Authority expressed concern about long-term affordability of the "affordable units" in such developments. He asked if cash payments to the Housing Authority would still be an option. Planning Administrator Michelle Collette said the Housing Authority told the Planning Board that it wanted the units constructed rather than receive the cash payments (see November 21, 2002 minutes).

Member Lewis agreed, noting the Planning Board wanted to have housing diversity instead of cash payments to the Groton Housing Authority.

Steve Webber asked how many affordable units would be required. Attorney Bobrowski said 10% if the units are low income and 15% if they are moderate income. Mr. Webber said this would still not provide the Town with the number of affordable units it needs to satisfy state requirements. Attorney Bobrowski said it is a very fine line between using special permit provisions to provide affordable units and using Chapter 40B.

Carl Flowers asked if cluster developments would be on water and sewer. Attorney Bobrowski said community water systems and shared sewage disposal facilities can be used to serve cluster developments.

Mr. Webber stated that the requirement for wood siding is unnecessary. Planning Board members agreed, and the language will be amended.

Robert Pine said the location of parking spaces should be more flexible and subject to the discretion of the Planning Board. The Board agreed.

Brooks Lyman said there should not be any reference to architectural design in the by-law.

Mr. Webber said a clause should be added to Section 1.14 (3) regarding payment to the Town if the Town must maintain open space. Attorney Bobrowski said the Town can place a lien on the property, and he will add language to that effect.

Harlan Fitch said the orientation of houses should not be limited so that houses can take advantage of solar orientation. He said TDR's do not have much financial value today and suggested that the use of TDR's not be controlled so strictly.

Paul Fitzgerald requested that all references to affordable housing be stricken from the proposed by-law because it is not the role of government to promote housing for different economic groups.

Member Perkins explained that Chapter 40B requires that 10% of the housing units must be affordable under state guidelines. In addition, the Planning Board is looking to create housing diversity. Most new housing is not very affordable.

Member Wilson said the goal to provide affordable housing is part of the Town's Comprehensive Master Plan.

Mr. Fitzgerald also requested that wetlands not be counted as part of the required open space and that the required buffer be increased from 50 ft to 150 ft. Member Clements said these suggestions have merit and he would like to give them more thought.

Member Wilson said he agreed that the 80,000 sq ft buildable area should not include wetlands as required in the Zoning By-law Computation of Lot Area requirements.

Member Perkins said she agreed that the required 35% open space should be uplands. Attorney Bobrowski said the 35% open space without any wetlands is in the current provisions.

Mr. Pine said the Planning Board should not have the right to determine who will own the open space as stated in §1.14 provided that the land is subject to a permanent conservation restriction. He said the bonus provisions in the by-law should be defined better. Member Perkins said the proposed by-law is much more specific about what is required and how bonuses are granted.

Mr. Pine asked why the ratio of TDR's to new units was changed from 1:1 to 1:2. Vice Chairman Barringer said to increase the number of two bedroom, affordable units. Attorney Bobrowski added that the two-bedroom units would not be deed restricted as "affordable" but the housing diversity will be increased by the construction of more two-bedroom units.

Member Clements asked if the Board should increase the buffer from 50 ft to 150 ft. Mr. Pine recommended staying with the 50 ft, especially for smaller parcels. The Board agreed.

### **Major Residential Development**

Attorney Bobrowski explained that the proposed changes to the Major Residential Development provisions are intended to simplify the process. Each applicant must submit a conventional plan and a special permit plan:

- Two conventional lots or a special permit plan for shared driveway and hammerhead lots;
- Three to eight conventional lots or a special permit plan for Residential Compound or Flexible Development;
- More than eight conventional lots or special permit plan for flexible development.

It is the Planning Board's decision whether the conventional plan or the special permit plan better serves the Town.

Mr. Pine said in some cases, the flexible development plan could be worse than a conventional plan. He suggested that the Board use the services of a landscape architect to assist in making this determination. Attorney Bobrowski said as a practical matter, if the Board chooses the flexible development option, it will be able to negotiate a better plan with the developer.

Mr. Fitzgerald requested that the Board eliminate all references to affordable housing because he believes such provisions constitute rent control.

Mr. Lyman asked if the affordable units are for rent or sale. Attorney Bobrowski said the by-law does not distinguish between rental or sale units.

### **Development Rate and Subdivision Phasing**

Attorney Bobrowski said he drafted new development rate and subdivision phasing provisions based upon the work done by the Growth Management Advisory Committee. The proposed by-law establishes a cap of forty (40) permits per year unless a special permit granted by the Planning Board exempts a development. He suggested that the Board consider exempting all flexible development plans.

Carrie Kneeland asked if the proposed cap would apply to flexible developments. Attorney Bobrowski said not as the by-law is written now.

Member Wilson said exempting flexible development plans will result in better design, but it is bad for growth.

Mr. Pine said the proposed by-law is very confusing. He asked if the cap would be administered on a first-come-first serve basis. He asked how the cap relates to the bonus system as proposed in flexible development. He asked how the Board could determine compliance with the Comprehensive Master Plan.

Attorney Bobrowski said the purpose of such caps in other towns is to push flexible development plans rather than conventional plans. He said the by-law would work better if all flexible plans were exempt.

Mr. Flowers asked how the 40 permits per year would work. He expressed concern that such a by-law would impact the market value of his land and his estate if he dies. Member Lewis asked if the by-law would force landowners to sell their property.

Member Wilson said if a landowner submits an alternative design plan it will be exempt from the cap. Such a plan will meet the needs of the town and the landowner. If flexibility is an option, the landowner will be able to come up with a better design.

Attorney Bobrowski urged the Board to consider exempting all flexible development plans from the cap. Member Lewis said he agrees, but the town is concerned about rapid growth. He said it is important to finish developments and road construction for the sake of the people living in the subdivision. Developments should be constructed in phases that can stand alone with drainage systems that function independently.

Amy Degen said if more units are permitted with flexible development, it defeats the purpose of the Development Rate Limitation. Attorney Bobrowski said the developments would be exempt from the cap but would be subject to the subdivision phasing provisions of 10 permits in 24 months unless the Planning Board grants a special permit.

Mr. Pine said if a landowner does not have a special permit, they could wait forever to be eligible for building permits. This is unfair to landowners who could be left waiting for years.

Mr. Fitzgerald requested that the cap be reduced from 40 to 30 permits a year. He asked if this will result in the number of units constructed under Chapter 40B.

Member Perkins expressed concern that the proposed Development Rate Limitation provisions will punish people who have not applied for comprehensive permits under Chapter 40B.

### **Open Space-Agricultural District**

Attorney Bobrowski explained the intent of establishing a new zoning district for land that is permanently protected by a conservation restriction or agricultural restriction. Steve Webber said if the new zoning district is established, the Board of Selectmen may set a lower tax rate for land in this district.

Mr. Lyman, who owns 100 acres of restricted land, supported the concept.

### **Scenic Roads Overlay District**

Attorney Bobrowski said the intent of this overlay district is to establish a 150 ft corridor along certain scenic roads. Planning Administrator Michelle Collette said the proposed map is based upon the DEM survey of Noteworthy and Distinctive Landscapes in the 1980's. The map was based upon information from MassGIS. Mr. Bobrowski said there is a problem with the map because districts shown on the map extend more than the 150 ft from the right-of-way, which is not consistent with the language in the by-law. The Districts should only extend 150 ft from the road.

Member Clements said the intent of the proposed overlay district is to combat the problem of NR lots and linear development.

Member Lewis said he did not support the concept because it is too costly for landowners. Historically, most buildings were constructed close to the road. He said he believes this by-law is a taking.

Steve Webber spoke in opposition to the proposed district which would require that every house lot in the district be subject to Site Plan Review by the Planning Board.

James Cullen said he is violently opposed to this proposal.

Brooks Lyman suggested that the Planning Board go back to the drawing board with this proposal.

Attorney Bobrowski said the by-law would designate an area within 150 ft of the street in the district as scenic. Member Clements said there should be deeper setbacks for arterial streets.

Josh Webber asked what the effective date would be if the by-law is adopted. Planning Administrator Michelle Collette said zoning amendments are in effect as of the date of the Town Meeting vote, subject to the approval of the Attorney General.

### **New Zoning Map**

Planning Administrator Michelle Collette explained that the new zoning map, prepared by Applied Geographics as part of the Town's GIS program, replaces and updates the Zoning Map adopted in 1998. There are no district changes shown on the new map.

The Board voted unanimously to continue the public hearing on April 17, 2003 at 8:30 PM.

### **PUBLIC HEARING – SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS-RESIDENTIAL COMPOUNDS**

In accordance with the provisions of the Subdivision Control Law, G.L. Chapter 41, Section 81Q, the Groton Planning Board will hold a public hearing on Thursday, April 3, 2003 at 8:30 PM in the Town Hall (second floor meeting room), 173 Main Street to consider proposed amendments to "Chapter 346, Subdivision of Land, of the Code of the Town of Groton" (Subdivision Regulations), to add a new section entitled, "Residential Compound Plan. The text of the proposed amendment is available in the Office of the Town Clerk and the Planning Board office in the Town Hall.

Vice Chairman Barringer called the public hearing to order. Clerk Wilson read the notice published in the March 19 and 26, 2003 issues of the Groton Landmark and March 21 and 28, 2003 issues of the Groton Herald. The Board's consultant, Attorney Mark Bobrowski, was present.

Attorney Bobrowski said the proposed subdivision regulations are very similar to the "Small Project" regulations that were in effect in the 1980's. The regulations are designed for small-scale subdivisions with not more than eight lots. The standards for road construction are less stringent than for a typical subdivision road. The road in a residential compound will be private and maintained by a homeowners association. The Board would endorse a definitive subdivision plan to be recorded at the Registry of Deeds. Attorney Bobrowski said there are many similar developments in Carlisle today.

Member Eliot asked if the residential compounds would include any affordable units. Attorney Bobrowski said not with the current proposal. Member Wilson added that smaller subdivisions are not required to have any affordable units under existing provisions.

Member Perkins asked if the 80,000 sq ft uplands requirement would still be in effect. Attorney Bobrowski said, "yes." The only change in dimensional requirements is to allow 50 ft instead of 225 ft frontage.

Member Perkins said she thought the regulations would require 1.5 times the acreage instead of 80,000 sq ft per lot. Mr. Pine disagreed and suggested that the Board not change the 80,000 sq ft lot requirements. Member Clements added that smaller lots could be created by using flexible development provisions.

Mr. Cullen said the proposed provisions are a mistake because homeowners will ask the Town to accept the substandard roads in the future. Member Lewis said this is the reason the Town dropped the previous small project provisions.

Member Wilson said deed restrictions can be required so homeowners understand the private road provisions. Attorney Bobrowski said the Town had a few bad experiences in the 1980's when homeowners did not understand the regulations. However, people understand these types of developments much better today. They are common in Carlisle, Concord and Leverett.

The Board voted unanimously to continue the public hearing on April 17, 2003 at 9:00 PM.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING (con't) – WATER DEPARTMENT SHARED DRIVEWAY**

The Board held the continuation of a public hearing to consider the application submitted by the Groton Water Department to use a shared driveway to serve the site of the proposed water storage tank on Brooks Orchard. Water Superintendent Thomas Orcutt, design engineer David Loring of Tighe and Bond, and landowner Steven Webber were present.

Mr. Loring said the Water Department would like to withdraw its application for a special permit because it will lease the land from Brooks Orchard, LLC, rather than purchase a new lot. Therefore a special permit is not required under §218-23D. The Board voted unanimously to accept the withdrawal of the application.

#### **SITE PLAN REVIEW – WATER DEPARTMENT STORAGE TANK**

The Board held the continuation of its review of the application submitted by the Groton Water Department for site plan approval of the proposed water storage tank on Brooks Orchard. Water Superintendent Thomas Orcutt, design engineer David Loring of Tighe and Bond, and landowner Steven Webber were present.

Harlan Fitch asked if the new storage tank would be visible from Chicopee Row. Vice Chairman Barringer said the dome will be above the current topography, but the tank will be in the ground so it will not be visible.

Engineer David Loring said the dome is at 520 ft and the existing hill is at 520 ft. The tree line to the north will block the view.

Abutter Amy Degen asked about hours of construction. Mr. Loring said from 7 AM to about 3 or 4 PM. Mr. Loring said the Water Department is willing to provide notice to abutters before active construction but does not want a condition restricting hours of operation. Mr. Orcutt agreed to notify abutters.



Ms. Degen asked how long construction would take. Mr. Loring said construction of the base slab will take two to three days and work must continue without interruption. There will be days of heavy construction activity followed by quiet periods.

Vice Chairman Barringer asked about the condition of the road after construction. Mr. Orcutt said they would work with the Town to improve the roads after construction of the tank is completed. A drainage system will be added and the Water Department will share in the costs to repair the road.

Planning Administrator Michelle Collette said the Earth Removal Advisory Committee granted an Erosion Control Permit for this project.

The Board will review and the draft site plan review decision and vote at its next meeting on April 10, 2003.

### **PUBLIC HEARING (con't) – SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS**

The Board continued the public hearing to consider revisions to the Subdivision regulations. The Board received the following language from Town Counsel Judith Cutler:

“§ 346-9C (1): The Planning Board will not approve a subdivision of land where access to any portion of the subdivision tract in Groton is through another Town.”

The motion was made by Clements to adopt the language prepared by Town Counsel. The motion was seconded.

Member Lewis said this is a dangerous practice. Many roads go from one town to the next today. He said he does not support this revision.

Member Perkins said she understands Member Lewis' concerns. However, the Board can waive the subdivision regulations when the situation warrants it.

The motion passed with Barringer, Clements, Perkins, and Wilson in favor; Lewis opposed.

### **ANNUAL & SPECIAL TOWN MEETING ARTICLES**

The Board will submit an article for the Special Permit Meeting to amend § 218-25.1 Personal Wireless Services Facilities. The following amendment was reviewed and edited by Town Counsel Patricia Cantor.

To delete existing item (3) which reads as follows:

“(3) Silver paint or galvanized finish shall be used on the portion of the outside of a personal wireless services tower that rises above the tree line in order to blend into the landscape.”

And by inserting in its place:

“(3) In order to blend into the landscape and minimize the visual impact of a personal wireless services tower that rises above the tree-line, the tower shall be finished in a manner acceptable to the Planning Board.”

The motion was made by Wilson to submit the language as drafted by Town counsel. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

The Board also decided not to go forward with the proposed Scenic Roads Overlay Districts because of problems with the map and the need to work more on public education.

Meeting adjourned at 11:00 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle Collette  
Planning Administrator

MC/lg