



Town of Carlisle

MASSACHUSETTS 01741

Office of

PLANNING BOARD

P.O. BOX 827
CARLISLE, MA 01741
(978) 369-9702

MINUTES

April 12, 1999

- Public Hearings: Proposed amendments to the Carlisle Zoning Bylaws**
- Open Space Neighborhoods (Sec. 5.8)**
- Home office uses (Sec. 3.2.1.11.5)**
- More than one dwelling on a single lot (Sec. 3.2.1.11.1 and 3.2.1.11.3)**
- Extension of Non-conforming Use (Sec. 6.3 – option 1 and option 2)**
- Special Permit and Site Plan Review for bank use in Residence A district (Sec. 3.2.5 and 7.6.1)**
- Floor area and resident age limits in Senior Residential Open Space Communities (Sec. 5.7.4.13 and 5.7.4.18)**
- Moratorium on Wireless Communications Facilities (Sec. 5.9)**
- Continued Public Hearing: Special Permit for Common Driveway to serve 5 lots at 138-142 East Street, Map 22, Lots 62, 62A, 62B, 63C, 63D and 71, Theodore Treibick, applicant**
- ANR Plan: Hutchins Road, Lots 2B and 3C, Tall Pines Realty Trust, applicant**
- Notice of receipt of Preliminary Plan for Deer Creek Estates, Map 25, Parcel 15, and referral to review engineer (Robert Kydd, applicant)**
- Notice of receipt of request for amendment of Definitive Subdivision Plan for Maplewood Road, Map 17, Parcel 17A (Robert Koning, applicant)**
- Review of Planning Board positions available and nominees in Town Election (Election: May 18, 1999)**

Chair Hengeveld called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. Members Abend, Epstein, Holzman and Reid were present. Tice arrived at 7:35 p.m. and Abend was only able to stay until 7:20 p.m. LaLiberte was not present this evening. Planning Administrator George Mansfield and *Mosquito* reporter David Ives were also present. The following members of the public were present for the public hearings: Ed Rolfe and Cindy Meuse of Maple Street; Anna and Joe Donovan, Matt Hamor, Deborah Hamor Kindlund, Fred Lewis, Beverly Porter, Laurie Tema-Lyn, Ron O'Reilly, Jo Romaniello and Philip Drew of Bedford Road; Dana Booth of River Road; Robert Koning and Robert Zielinski of Acton Street; Jerome Lerman of Stearns Street; David Kelch of Oak Knoll Road; Frank Golis of Brook Street; Jennine Blum of Elizabeth Ridge Road; Michael Fitzgerald of Autumn Lane; Paul Gill of Judy Farm Road; Marjie Findlay of Rockland Road; Jane and Mike Kayat of East Street; John and Annette Lee of Lowell Road; John Ballantine of Fiske Street; Douglas Stevenson of Cross Street; and Tony O'Neil, Treasurer of the North Middlesex Savings Bank.

Bills were circulated for signature.

Public Hearing: Proposed amendment to the Carlisle Zoning Bylaw (Sec. 5.8) Open Space Neighborhoods

Epstein stated that this amendment is the only warrant article proposed by the Planning Board. He began by noting that the PB cannot prevent subdivisions from being built, but they can regulate them. He explained that the proposed bylaw amendment allows clustering of the development in order to preserve larger tracts of open space. This would be done by allowing reduced minimum lot sizes in exchange for preservation of open space, while still maintaining the overall lot density on the parcel. Epstein stated that this type of development could be considered for any parcel of ten-acres or more. He noted that there are approximately 56 such parcels still available in Town, not including those that could be combined. Epstein reminded the public that this development option would be treated as a subdivision and would still require approval from the other land use boards. Epstein emphasized the fact that this form of development will be optional for the landowner and will provide an additional tool for the Planning Board. None of the current development options will be eliminated. In concluding his opening presentation,

Epstein noted that this proposed bylaw amendment has been endorsed by the Selectmen, Board of Health, Conservation Commission and the Carlisle Land Trust.

Ron O'Reilly asked if this type of development had been used for a development on Pope Road in Acton. The Board noted that this question had come up in the past and it has since been determined that the development in question was actually an ANR development.

Bob Koning asked how the number of lots allowed on the parcel would be determined. Epstein referred him to sections 5.8.4.1 and 5.8.4.2, which outline two options for determining this number. The applicant may present a conceptual subdivision plan showing the number of lots that could reasonably be developed within all land use regulations. The PB will then make a determination based on input from other land use boards. Alternatively, the applicant may calculate the number of lots by dividing the "developable area" by two acres. "Developable area" would exclude all wetlands and other restricted areas. Epstein noted that if this bylaw amendment passes at Town Meeting, the Board would draft accompanying rules and regulations, which would be very similar to the subdivision rules and regulations.

(Abend left the meeting.)

Koning asked if there would be minimum frontage and setback requirements. Epstein noted that a minimum frontage of 20 ft. is required in section 5.8.5.2. Section 5.8.5.3 states that "each lot shall have at least 50% of the required setbacks for the district."

Epstein reminded the public that, in contrast to the conventional subdivision laws, this form of development is not by-right and will be at the Board's discretion. He clarified the Town's need for such a bylaw noting that the existing subdivision regulations do not encourage open space and the conservation cluster is not always flexible enough with lot sizes.

Frank Golis asked if any consideration had been given to the location of the open space and its aesthetic value. Epstein replied that this would be at the Board's discretion although the proposed bylaw does require that a certain percentage of the open space be contiguous. Epstein noted that developers have been coming to the Board with conceptual plans, which allows the Board to encourage the best type of development for each situation. The Open Space Neighborhood would give the Board and developers one more option.

Dave Kelch asked for clarification on the use of the open space for utilities such as septic facilities. Epstein explained that in discussions with the BOH it was noted that a septic system may not fit entirely on a smaller lot and there might be situations where the use of a combined leaching area or well would be advantageous. In such cases, the Town would not assume liability for that portion of the open space, but rather have it deeded to a homeowners association. Epstein referred the public to section 5.8.6.7, which explains the various options for conveying the open space parcels.

This public hearing was closed a 7:30 p.m.

Public Hearing: Proposed amendment to the Carlisle Zoning Bylaws (Sec. 3.2.1.11.5) Home office uses

Dave Kelch of the Bylaw Review Committee presented this proposal. He explained that there has been increasing concern with physician and dentist offices as accessory uses in residential areas. He noted that while these businesses should not be discouraged, they should be monitored to address traffic and parking issues. The Bylaw Review Committee proposes to do this by requiring a special permit for such home office uses. The Zoning Board of Appeals would oversee the site plan review, specifically to regulate traffic and parking issues. Kelch noted that traditionally, Carlisle has been liberal while other area communities are more restrictive regarding home office uses.

Reid asked if existing businesses would be grandfathered. Kelch stated that any use in existence prior to the advertisement of this hearing would be grandfathered. Reid then asked if the PB would be involved in the site plan review process. Kelch said that only the ZBA is currently involved. Reid suggested that the PB has expertise in the areas of lighting, screening, parking and traffic, and should be considered for site plan review. Kelch said he would bring it up for consideration by the committee.

(Tice arrived.)

Anna Donovan asked if an actual denial for such a special permit had been considered. Koning, speaking as the building inspector, stated that special permits are sometimes denied. Donovan expressed concern that the guidelines are nebulous and grounds for approval or denial are not clear. Kelch noted that through the special permit process it would be the applicant's responsibility to make the abutters comfortable with the planned accessory use.

Frank Golis asked about the process and how abutters are notified. Kelch stated that the ZBA would be required to notify abutters of a special permit hearing. Mansfield explained that abutters are those directly adjacent to the property plus all those within 300 ft. of the property in question.

Holzman asked why physicians and dentists had been singled out to require special permits. Kelch explained that these two categories of businesses were of immediate concern and the Bylaw Review Committee wished to make the amendments simple to understand and enforce. He noted that other Towns require a special permit based on the number of employees or the number of cars accessing the site, but these statistics are difficult to monitor and enforce.

Reid noted that she has neighbors who are a psychologist and a psychiatrist respectively. Would one need a special permit and the other not? Kelch agreed that it might seem as though the physicians and dentists are being singled out unfairly, but the committee felt it would be easier to enforce the bylaw based upon the type of business rather than upon the number of employees. Koning stated that he has had several complaints against physicians and dentists over the years, but has been unable to act upon them based on the existing bylaw.

Reid suggested that the bylaw be broadened to define home businesses by the number of employees or the number of clients. Bob Zielinski, also of the Bylaw Review Committee, explained that the Town has been friendly toward home businesses. The committee is simply trying to address the growing concern over doctor and dentist offices. He noted that other businesses could be addressed in the future if they become a problem.

Ron O'Reilly asked under what conditions a physician or dentist would be allowed to have a home office. Kelch explained that the ZBA would conduct a special permit hearing and ensure that adequate measures are taken to screen parking facilities and minimize traffic impact on the neighborhood.

Frank Golis agreed with Reid's statements and suggested that businesses with clients be treated separately from individuals working at home.

Koning noted that there are many home businesses in the Town that do not create a problem. He has only found problems with doctor and dentist offices.

Holzman asked why some professions were enumerated in the bylaw, while many others are not listed at all. Kelch explained that the committee wished to make as few changes as possible. Zielinski also noted that other businesses would be included in the phrase "may include but are not limited to." Holzman suggested that all home occupations be held to the same standards.

Epstein asked how the Bylaw Review Committee was established and if the ZBA had input. Kelch explained that the Selectmen appointed the committee and the ZBA gave extensive input noting areas that gave them difficulty. The Building Inspector also gave input. Epstein asked if the ZBA endorsed the bylaw amendment as drafted. When Kelch replied that they had not seen it, Epstein suggested that they obtain ZBA endorsement before Town Meeting.

This hearing was closed at 8:02 p.m. The Chair called for a recommendation from the Board. After a brief discussion the Board decided to conduct all public hearings first and to make recommendations at the conclusion of the public hearings this evening.

Public Hearing: Proposed amendment to the Carlisle Zoning Bylaws (Sec. 3.2.1.11.1 and 3.2.1.11.3) More than one dwelling on a single lot

Bob Zielinski of the Bylaw Review Committee stated that this proposed bylaw change originated from the building inspector. Koning explained that in some instances, accessory structures are being converted into dwelling units with individual septic systems. This essentially creates two homes on a single lot, but can not be prevented under the existing bylaws. Zielinski noted that the bylaw change would not affect rental of rooms or accessory apartments.

Reid asked if accessory buildings that are already occupied would be grandfathered, but a definitive answer was not given. Koning stated that it would be difficult to enforce, because it is not known which accessory structures are currently occupied. Frank Golis wanted to be certain that this bylaw only affects the accessory structures and he was assured that was true.

This public hearing was then closed at 8:10 p.m.

Public Hearing: Proposed amendment to the Carlisle Zoning Bylaws (Sec. 6.3 – option 1 and option 2) Extension of Non-conforming Use

Bob Zielinski read the existing section 6.3 and noted that there were many ambiguous terms. The ZBA had found it difficult to interpret this particular bylaw and asked the Bylaw Review Committee to revise and clarify it.

The Bylaw Review Committee proceeded to draft two options for revision. Option one, presented as Article 26 in draft #10 of the warrant, explicitly states that the 50% limitation applies to all expansions of non-conforming structures and non-conforming uses. It also replaces the term “floor area” with “building footprint.” Option two, presented as Article 27 in draft #10 of the warrant, clarifies the terms as in option one, but adds a statement which excludes the enlargement of single-family residences from any such limitations. The ZBA wanted to place both options on the Town Meeting warrant allowing residents to decide which option is best.

Both residents and PB members were confused about the options and asked for clarification. The Bylaw Review Committee said that essentially, option one allows the footprint of a non-conforming structure to be increased up to 50%, while option two allows residential structures unlimited expansion within setback requirements.

Rolfe asked if Town owned buildings would be included, but the Board noted that municipal buildings would be exempt.

Mansfield noted that this bylaw is difficult because it deals with non-conforming uses and non-conforming structures, and applies to residential and non-residential properties. For the benefit of the public, Mansfield then outlined the application process. An applicant would first go before the ZBA to determine if there is a non-conformity and if it is being increased. If the ZBA finds that the non-conformity would be increased, a special permit and public hearing would be required.

Mansfield then asked the Bylaw Review Committee how it would proceed if both options were approved at Town Meeting. He suggested that Article 26 be withdrawn and amending Article 27 on Town Meeting floor if necessary.

Jerry Lerman went on record to say that his is strongly in favor of option two.

The Board noted that these Articles were very difficult to understand and suggested clarifying the issues before Town Meeting. They also asked if the ZBA had an opinion on these options, but Zielinski said that the ZBA has not seen them.

This hearing was closed at 8:40 p.m.

Continued Public Hearing: Special Permit for Common Driveway to serve 5 lots at 138-142 East Street, Map 22, Lots 62, 62A, 62B, 63C, 63D and 71, Theodore Treibick, applicant

The applicant was not present for the hearing. Reid moved to approve the Special Permit for a Common Driveway to serve 5 lots at 138-142 East Street, Map 22, Lots 62, 62A, 62B, 63C, 63D and 71 shown on a plan and profile of the common driveway prepared by R. Wilson and Assoc., for Theodore Treibick, dated 7/1/98 last revised 2/8/99. Tice seconded the motion. Reid felt that the plan could not be approved because it does not serve any approved lots. The board voted 0-5, thus the motion failed and the special permit was denied. The public hearing was closed at 8:45 p.m.

Public Hearing: Proposed amendment to the Carlisle Zoning Bylaws (Sec. 3.2.5) Special Permit for bank use in Residence A district

Dave Kelch of the Bylaw Review Committee presented the proposed amendment. He said its purpose would be to allow a bank to locate in the center of Town in a Residence A district through a ZBA special permit. Kelch explained that the Residence A district is located at the center of Town, with a 1500-ft. radius from the "Liberty" monument. This district allows lots to be less than two acres. The committee felt that granting a special permit through the ZBA would be better than rezoning a particular area for business use. This bylaw would create a new special permit category.

Epstein noted that under section 3.2.2 of the existing bylaws the ZBA is already authorized to grant special permits for certain businesses in Residence A and B districts. He asked why banks should be in a separate section. Kelch explained that they wished to limit banks to the Residence A district only. Epstein asked where the business district is. Kelch explained that it is within the Residence A district.

Anna Donovan argued that Carlisle does not have a business district, but rather certain lots that are zoned for business use. These lots already had businesses existing at the time the zoning laws were enacted in 1932.

Ron O'Reilly asked if the Bylaw Review Committee is in support of this article. Kelch explained that the committee is simply offering this amendment to the Town and takes no position.

Philip Drew admitted that he lives directly across from the proposed bank site and expressed concern over having a 24-hour commercial operation in a residential neighborhood. Tony O'Neil, treasurer of the North Middlesex Savings Bank responded to his concerns by saying that they do not propose to add to any street lighting and the bank's lights would be turned off after business hours. He said that only security lights would remain on at night.

Ron O'Reilly questioned how the Town would benefit by allowing financial institutions to be located in a residential district.

Anna Donovan, a resident since 1964, noted that there has been very little commercial development in the past 35 years. She feared that approval of this bylaw could spur commercial development within the Residence A district. She also questioned why this district has been singled out. She stated that the only distinction between the Residence A and Residence B districts is lot size. She felt that this bylaw would unfairly change the character of one neighborhood.

Frank Golis asked if there was a difference in tax rate between business and residential properties. Holzman said that the tax rate is the same.

Ron O'Reilly asked why the review period for the special permit was set at five years. Koning explained that currently the ZBA decides the review period at the time of the application, but in this case they would not be required to make that decision.

Jon Lee asked for clarification of the business zone and Epstein noted that the bylaws refer to the "Carlisle Center Business District" as having a 600-ft. radius from the "Liberty" monument. No further description of this "Business District" was given other than a note that it was enacted in 1974 under Article 1 of Town Meeting.

Ed Rolfe was concerned over potential criminal activity and asked if statistics could be provided concerning robbery rates at other banks. O'Neil said the banks are equipped with silent alarms and local police are invited to review the facility. He was not aware of any branch of the North Middlesex Savings Bank being subject to a robbery.

The hearing was closed at 9:20 p.m.

Public Hearing: Proposed amendment to the Carlisle Zoning Bylaws (Sec. 7.6.1) Site Plan Review for bank use in Residence A district

Kelch stated that this article would only be moved if the previous article regarding the special permit for bank use is passed. This article would give the Board of Selectmen the responsibility for site plan review in the event a special permit is granted for bank use in Residence A.

Anna Donovan felt there was no need to review this amendment since it refers only to the previous article, which clearly lacked public support. She added that there is no need for a bank in town if there are no other businesses there. She felt these two articles should not be considered unless the Town wishes to change its character.

Epstein thought that this article would give responsibility for site plan review to the Selectmen for other non-residential uses as well and could be applied to situations other than for bank use only.

The PA noted that the original draft of this warrant article did contain wording referring only to the bank article. He suggested that this issue be clarified with the Board of Selectmen.

This hearing was closed at 9:40 p.m.

Public Hearing: Proposed amendment to the Carlisle Zoning Bylaws (Sec. 5.7.4.13 and 5.7.4.18) Floor area and resident age limits in Senior Residential Open Space Communities

The hearing was officially opened, but no one was in attendance to present this article. The PA was under the impression that the petitioner had intended to be there this evening so the hearing was continued to later in the evening.

Public Hearing: Proposed amendment to the Carlisle Zoning Bylaws (Sec. 5.9) Moratorium on Wireless Communications Facilities

Paul Gill gave a presentation using overhead transparencies to give background information and to outline the reasons for proposing a six-month moratorium. He explained that six companies have submitted nine proposals in response to the Town's RFP for wireless communications facilities on four Town-owned sites. Gill noted that the proposals have been submitted with inadequate site plans and are not well defined. A moratorium would give the

Town time to refine its requirements and to review the proposals comprehensively. Gill proposed that the Town should form a Wireless Communications Facilities Advisory Committee made up of volunteers with at least two members having an engineering background. This committee would make recommendations to the Selectmen. An independent Radio Frequency Engineer should also be hired to evaluate and monitor the process. The WCF Adv.Comm. would review the existing zoning bylaw to evaluate setback requirements, tower height, noise pollution from generators, regulation of telecom operations and telecom-paid monitoring provisions.

Dana Booth pointed out several deficiencies in the existing WCF bylaw. He noted that he had attended meetings with Nextel and found that they did not provide a comprehensive site plan. He added that the telecommunications companies argue that a tower is needed in Carlisle because there is only 10% coverage in Town. When Booth spoke with a customer representative at Nextel, however, he was assured that he would be covered in Carlisle via a tower in Concord.

Hengeveld asked if a six-month moratorium would be sufficient to complete all the outlined tasks. Gill said he was concerned that the Attorney General would not grant a moratorium of one year. Selectmen Ballantine said that, according to Town Counsel, it was not clear if a moratorium would be legal.

Mansfield explained that he had recently attended a conference at which this issue had been discussed and he learned that a moratorium of 6-months to one-year would be upheld by the Attorney General. He spoke with Town Counsel about this today, and Counsel agreed that the PA's information is reliable.

Holzman stated that he designs communications towers and yet he supports the moratorium. He explained that there are many creative ways to design and disguise such towers and the communications companies are willing to meet the needs of the community. Holzman felt that the communications companies would not fight a moratorium, but that they would sue the Town if denied outright.

Several residents expressed concern about health issues regarding the communications facilities, but were told that, under federal law, health and environmental concerns may not be considered when siting the towers.

Ron O'Reilly asked how the review process would be handled within the moratorium. Gill said that the current bylaws would remain in effect and should be strengthened during the process. O'Reilly also asked what the Planning Board's role is. Hengeveld explained that the Board will make a report to Town Meeting.

Koning mentioned that the oil tanks at the River Road site, the subject of a current Nextel application, have been removed and during that process it was discovered that this is a wetlands location and it must again be reviewed by ConsCom.

The public hearing was closed at 10:15 p.m.

Continued Public Hearing: Proposed amendment to the Carlisle Zoning Bylaws (Sec. 5.7.4.13 and 5.7.4.18) Floor area and resident age limits in Senior Residential Open Space Communities

The petitioner was still not present, but Selectmen Doug Stevenson said he had spoken with the petitioner regarding this proposed amendment. He said that this article was presented by residents and proposes to increase the size limit of an SROSC while lowering the minimum age requirement. Stevenson felt that this amendment would encourage older residents of Carlisle to stay in the community. The Board decided to keep the public hearing open and continued it to April 26, 1999 at 7:45 p.m.

Planning Board recommendations on the proposed amendments to the Carlisle Zoning Bylaws

Open Space Neighborhoods (Sec. 5.8) - Reid moved to support the Open Space Neighborhood Article as presented. Tice seconded the motion and it carried 5-0.

Home office uses (Sec. 3.2.1.11.5) – Tice moved to write a favorable report in support of the bylaw related to home office use. Reid seconded the motion. Reid said she was concerned that this bylaw relates specifically to dentists and physicians. Epstein noted that the proposed amendment is addressing a known concern and problem. He was concerned that the amendment would not pass at Town Meeting if it were expanded to include all home office uses. Epstein also felt uncomfortable making a decision without input from the ZBA, since they would have jurisdiction over this bylaw. Selectmen Stevenson said that the ZBA would not comment on the proposed zoning amendments because they view themselves as a judiciary body only. The ZBA wants the Town to write the bylaws. Epstein felt uncomfortable making any recommendations on zoning bylaw changes, which would fall under ZBA jurisdiction, without having their input. Holzman and Tice also felt uncomfortable about singling out physicians and dentists. Tice then withdrew the motion on the table and instead, moved to vote “no recommendation” on this article. Reid seconded and the motion carried 4-1 with Holzman opposed.

More than one dwelling on a single lot (Sec. 3.2.1.11.1 and 3.2.1.11.3) – Reid moved to recommend this article. Holzman seconded and the motion was approved 5-0.

Extension of Non-conforming Use (Sec. 6.3 – option 1) – This article limits expansion of non-conforming use and non-conforming structures to 50%. Reid moved to not recommend this article and to draft a non-favorable report. Tice seconded the motion. Reid felt this option should not be recommended because the ZBA had not reviewed it for clarity. The Board voted 4-0-1 on the above motion with Epstein abstaining.

Extension of Non-conforming Use (Sec. 6.3 – option 2) – This article limits expansion of non-conforming use and non-conforming structures to 50%, but excludes residences. Reid moved to recommend this article favorably. Tice seconded and the motion carried 4-0-1 with Epstein abstaining.

Special Permit and Site Plan Review for bank use in Residence A district (Sec. 3.2.5) – Reid moved to recommend no support of this article and to write a non-favorable report. Tice seconded. Reid explained that this proposed amendment should not be limited to use within Residence A. The motion was approved 4-0-1 with Epstein abstaining.

Special Permit and Site Plan Review for bank use in Residence A district (Sec. 7.6.1) – Reid felt this article should not be recommended, but Epstein thought that it might expand the Selectmen’s ability to review site plans other than for bank use only. He then moved to make a favorable recommendation in support of this article, welcoming further clarification from the Board of Selectmen. Tice seconded. Epstein asked the Selectmen present if the intent of this amendment was to broaden site plan review for other projects. Ballantine explained that this bylaw was intended to relate only to the proposed bank use bylaw. Epstein then withdrew the motion and Reid moved to not recommend this article. Holzman seconded and the motion carried 4-0-1 with Epstein abstaining. Epstein asked that a note be added in the report indicating that the PB is not recommending this article because it is tied specifically to bank use. Reid noted, however, that the PB would be in favor of this article if the previous article regarding bank use is passed at Town Meeting. The Board discussed options of presenting this statement and then Reid moved to reconsider the vote on the previous motion. Tice seconded and the Board agreed 5-0. Epstein then moved that the PB recommends this article if, and only if, the previous article regarding bank use is passed at Town Meeting. Tice seconded this motion and the Board approved it 5-0.

Moratorium on Wireless Communications Facilities (Sec. 5.9) – Tice moved to provide a favorable report with a specific recommendation that the moratorium be expanded to twelve months subject to Town Counsel review and support of this recommendation, and that a WCF Advisory Committee be established. Epstein seconded and the motion carried 5-0.

ANR Plan: Hutchins Road, Lots 2B and 3C, Tall Pines Realty Trust, applicant

Hengeveld recused herself as an abutter and Epstein assumed the Chair. Reid moved to endorse the ANR plan entitled Tall Pines Realty Trust, dated 3/19/99 as approval not required. Tice seconded and the ANR was endorsed 4-0.

Notice of receipt of Preliminary Plan for Deer Creek Estates, Map 25, Parcel 15, and referral to review engineer (Robert Kydd, applicant)

The PA explained that a preliminary plan had been received and noted that it proposes 4 lots off Oak Knoll Road and 3 lots off Nickles Lane. The Board assigned LandTech as the review engineer.

Review of Planning Board positions available and nominees in Town Election (Election: May 18, 1999)

The PA noted that Louise Hara has agreed to run for one of the available PB positions, but there is still another position available and no one has stepped forward to run. Hengeveld explained that she had called and asked approximately ten people to consider the position, but was not successful.

At 11:02 p.m. the Board unanimously adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,



Anja M. Stam
Recording Secretary