

PLANNING BOARD
148 Peck Street
Rehoboth, MA 02769
(508) 252-6891 Telephone
(508) 252-5342 Facsimile



Christopher Cooper, Chairman
Robert Moitozo, Vice Chair
Edward Bertozzi
Tomas Ennis
William Costa Sr.
Jake Kramer
Tish Vadnais
Lynne Ferreira, Assoc. Mbr.
Daniel Roach, Town Planner

RECEIVED
22 JAN 21 AM 8:53
OFFICE OF THE TOWN CLERK
REHOBOTH, MA

**Meeting Minutes
January 20, 2021
Remote Meeting
7:00 PM**

Present: Christopher Cooper, Robert Moitozo, Edward Bertozzi, Tomas Ennis, Jake Kramer, Tish Vadnais, Lynne Ferreira, Associate Member, and Daniel Roach, Town Planner.

Absent:

Mr. Cooper began the meeting with the Pledge of allegiance at 7:02p.m.

Form A

1. Hoyle – Dean Street – 20-21A

Ms. Rachel Smith of Otis Dyer's office was present.

Ms. Smith presented plans.

Mr. Paul Costello, attorney for the buyer was present.

Mr. Cooper stated that the language said that there should be no further development on the land what so ever.

Ms. Smith stated she thought he did a good job of trying to cover everything.

Ms. Ferreira stated that in the wording there should be a reference back to the current deed.

Ms. Smith stated that just below section one, it does say see the deeds with a book and page reference.

Ms. Ferreira asked where that was located on the document?

Ms. Smith stated the second page.

Ms. Ferreira asked if they could place that on the first page.

Mr. Costa made a motion to endorse the Form A with deed restrictions as discussed.

Mr. Kramer seconded the motion. Roll call vote; all replied aye. Motion passes.

2. Viveiros – Tremont Street – 21-01A

Ms. Rachel Smith of Otis Dyer's office was present.

Ms. Smith presented plans.

Mr. Kramer made a motion to endorse the Form A.

Mr. Bertozzi seconded the motion. Roll call vote; all replied aye. Motion passes.

New Business

1. 242 Anawan Street - Discussion

Mr. Jay Talerman, Town Counsel, Mr. William McDonough, Zoning Enforcement Officer and Building Inspector, and Mr. Jim Muri, on behalf of the Board of Selectman, were present.

Ms. Vadnais asked if the applicant had been invited to the meeting?

Mr. Roach stated he had not.

Mr. Cooper stated that the reason we are all here is regarding 242 Anawan Street. Gave a brief summary of what has occurred.

Mr. Bertozzi stated that the point of the Planning Board was that there was a previously approved site plan. There is a significant change of use and that a modification of the site plan should be done.

Mr. Muri stated when we reviewed the application for auto sales permit, we had an opinion from the Zoning Enforcement Officer that it didn't require a site plan approval. That is what the Board of Selectmen based their opinion and not to refer to the Planning Board. His hope was that the Planning Board and Zoning Enforcement Officer could resolve the issue and how to move forward.

Mr. Talerma gave a brief overview of where he stood on the issue as Town Counsel.

Mr. McDonough stated he still believed that he did the right thing. He felt that getting to this point months later without having anybody from the Planning Board reach out to him and go around and go to Town Counsel and Board of Selectmen. He didn't appreciate that. He had spoken to Mr. Roach a few times; he knew where he stood on this issue. The by-laws need to be updated. We can't just pick and choose what we are and not going to do. He would be more than happy to deal with Mr. Roach on this as the point person and asking Mr. Roach his opinion.

Mr. Cooper stated that zoning by-laws are very unclear and very hard to interpret.

Ms. Vadnais stated that the Planning Board needs to be uniform across the board on everything. She gave examples. She wished the applicant was present tonight. She would have like their opinion on things.

Mr. Cooper stated that he agreed with Ms. Vadnais to a certain degree, given the ambiguities around the language in the zoning by-laws.

Mr. Bertozzi stated that he agreed with Ms. Vadnais. The difference between 242 Anawan Street and other cases is that we had already approved the site plan. The person that wanted to do an antique shop, we didn't have an existing site plan. The zoning was still in affect for the one already approved because there was no expiration date. He thought that the owner should have come back to the board and they were going to do something different. He wanted to have the existing site plan modified. The used car lot is different than a flower shop in an area off of 44.

Mr. Cooper stated that he thought we had talked about everything. Thanked everyone for coming. Feel free to reach out to any member of the board at any point.

Mr. Muri asked Mr. Talerma if he had seen by-laws in other communities that deal with a significant change of use and a mechanism for refereeing that to the Planning Board? Have other towns used to reconcile disputes when a change of occupancy happens?

Mr. Talerma stated that it would depend on how you want to approach it. A change of use is going to require you, in most cases, to go to the Zoning Enforcement Officer/ Building Inspector. If your zoning by-laws require that a change of use triggers a certain kind of changes of use trigger a site plan review than that gets picked up when someone comes to the Zoning Enforcement Officer/Building Inspector for a change of use. Could you build a process where by there is a link between the Zoning Enforcement officer/ Building Inspector's office and the Planning Board's office, sure you can. Some towns do a weekly meeting between department heads. These bylaws are very common. The fact that yours captures too much, I think is what Mr. McDonough's concerns have been. It doesn't mean it couldn't be enforced; it might mean you might want to think about what it's catching. Is the new too big. How ever you want to set up the protocols, you can set them.

Mr. McDonough stated there is a mechanism we have now with our online permitting. He has the ability to send any permit that comes into him to the town planner for sign off.

Mr. Muri offered further support from the IT Director if it is needed.

Mr. McDonough stated that it is already all set up.

Mr. Cooper thanked everyone for coming. This is a positive step forward.

Public Hearing

1. 90 Pond Street – Rehoboth Renewables – 19-01 Solar, 19-03 SPA, 19-04 GWSP

Mr. Gioiosa of Sitec Engineering was present.

Mr. Gioiosa presented revised plans.

Mr. Jay Talerman Town Counsel was present.

Mr. Talerman stated that this project in particular having to evaluate individually the relative strength of concerns about it to the way it should go. Mr. Roach asked me to comment on solar generally. Spoke in regards to the Dover amendment and how it pertains to solar projects in general and this project in particular.

Mr. Bertozzi stated that he felt that the site is simply too close to houses. The applicant has done everything they can. To have a 20' screening in a residential neighborhood, he didn't think it's in harmony and compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. The by-laws talk about screening, read the part of the solar by-law the deals with screening. Spoke about the 8' foot fence that was initially proposed. Asked Mr. Talerman if the town meeting to change the by-law to say that any of the facility including fences must be at least 500' from any house?

Mr. Talerman stated there was a small line of cases where some judges, out of the land court, has said as long as you're allowing solar some where you can essentially deny it elsewhere. He thought those decisions were a little strange because the language of solar exemption or the solar provision of the Dover Amendment are really not different in substance than religious, agricultural, educational. Those cases say you can't prohibit it anywhere. You can but whatever you want in your by-law, but if it has the affect of making a solar project on any specific property in any district in town not feasible because of the 500' setback then you are not going to apply it. He felt the better approach to it would be to subject all solar projects more broadly based. To address uses as they arise with respect to impacts to neighboring properties, drainage, access, emergencies and so then just kind of leave it broader based. So that the Planning Board can look at specific situations and get creative with the conditions that they may apply. I would rather you take each project and look at it as it may impact the neighborhood and without some ridged criteria to have the ability to get creative.

Mr. Ennis asked how they define "welfare" in relationship to the Dover Amendment?

Mr. Talerman stated he had never really seen a great definition in all the cases in what welfare is. I'm not sure of the courts if it was welfare in that it morphias the neighborhood doesn't like it then the good welfare of the town is for districts to stay primarily residential in character with preservation of as many trees as possible. I can't point you to a specific definition. It provides some comfort level that discussing things like screening which doesn't necessarily go to public health or safety. Unless there is a true glare issue. They do fit under that kind of neighborhood character, which kind of goes to welfare. So, I think that it kind of touches on the area at least it would get a courts attention if you were working on the view sheds and pure esthetics. Those are the majority of the complaints with solar projects. We still have some glare cases, drainage cases, access cases under the solar cases. But the majority of them are the same issues that have arisen here with glare and the welfare arm of the statute is really what we work on for these things. The applicants are in a business that they'd rather work with us than fight against us or fight the neighbors.

Mr. Cooper asked if the board had any more questions for Mr. Talerman or on what had been presented?

Mr. Ennis stated that Mr. Gioiosa said that the new screen is going to be a chain link fence with a tight knit mesh covering?

Mr. Gioiosa stated that the fence would be a farm fence and explained the detail on the plan. Then explained how the proposed screening would work, where it would be installed, and what it would look like.

Mr. Ennis asked how will it be maintained? Will it be inspected?

Mr. Gioiosa explained how it would be maintained.

Mr. Cooper asked if there were any questions from the audience?

Ms. Rachel Bauman – Echlin of 122 Pond Street was present.

Ms. Bauman – Echlin asked for clarification of Mr. Talerman's relationship to the board.

Mr. Roach stated he is Town Counsel for the town. He is one of the town attorneys.

Ms. Bauman – Echlin stated in bringing up the Dover Amendment, solar is allowed somewhere in town but not necessarily everywhere?

Mr. Talerman stated no, that was a former view by a prior judge. Those cases have been reversed and more or less where people seek to do restrictions from in one part of town in and of themselves are not likely enforceable. If a site is entirely inappropriate for it that could be enforceable. But that would have to be based on the merits, not just based upon a district designation.

Ms. Bauman – Echlin stated section 4.10.4.5 of the town by-laws. Asked what is the relationship of the by-law to the boards permissible action here?

Mr. Talerman stated it is some what aspirational. He was sorry to say, he thought that the by-law can be interpreted consistent with the Dover Amendment. If those criteria are not applied in a way that would nullify a solar project. To the extent that you read the by-law to go beyond what the statute is saying. In a way that would enable the Planning Board to say no or the unreasonable restrict or condition the solar by-law. He thought the statute would preempt local laws were inconsistent. He mentioned that every town has these lengthy solar by-laws and he thought the way that the statutory interpretation has evolved is that a lot of extra details and areas of regulations under these by-laws probably has to yield to an interpretation of statute that's a little more protective of solar uses. Again, and unfortunately, because he represents cities and towns and he'd like to see towns have as much discretion as possible but that's not the way these cases happen.

Ms. Bauman – Echlin stated as a point of clarification. What you are saying is that the town actually has no authority, actually has no authority to decide the granting of a special permit?

Mr. Talerman stated he said that is not true. They do have authority but within the limited bandwidth allowed by the statute. In cases it even says they could deny a project if there's an intractable problem with it. They can certainly condition a project to ensure, reasonably so, public health, safety and welfare. What they can't do is use their power in the same way they would for a special permit. The state has chosen to protect several types of uses; agricultural, education, religious, day care facilities, congregate housing, solar projects. The state has chosen to give them certain exemptions from local by-laws. That's unfortunately where we are. It doesn't mean the by-law is useless, it doesn't mean the Planning Board has no power, it means that they don't have as much power as they would in another contest.

Ms. Bauman – Echlin stated so, she guessed she would be curious as to how the board has potentially is looking to continue to try to satisfy the will of the constituents and the immediate neighborhood. She was not aware of a third part having done an independent assessment. Where does the board stand on that?

Mr. Cooper stated what the board has done to try to address the concerns of the neighborhood.

Mr. Roach spoke in regards to the research he had done with the peer review engineer and the Assessor's office regarding property values.

Ms. Bauman – Echlin stated there has not been an independent third-party assessment done?

Mr. Roach stated not by the board.

Ms. Bauman – Echlin asked why it hadn't been done and would one be done?

Mr. Cooper stated that the board had looked into it and that there was not a lot of evidence out there, from what he had seen.

Ms. Bauman Echlin stated to Mr. Cooper she felt that there was not a sense of urgency towards this.

Mr. Bertozzi stated Spoke in regards to the Planning Board's budget. Also spoke in regards to the solar by-law regarding the part that speaks about the Planning Board being able to hire an outside consultant at the applicant t's cost. Ask Mr. Talerman if the board could hire someone under that provision, what would the affects of the Dover amendment be towards it? If the board or the neighbors hired someone, would that be a sufficient basis where the Planning Board could reject the application, the validity of that, and would it stand up in court?

Mr. Talerman stated that on its own, probably not. The question of value does potentially relate to welfare. We know that affordable housing context under Chapter 40B that the courts have specifically said that this

is a use that people have to live with. The fact that it may be unpopular in neighborhoods is exactly why we have statute. So, the value on its own is sufficient to form from the basis to challenge. It would be inappropriate on its own to be considered as a means of denying a solar project. That said if you have some reasonable regulations regarding screening, which you do, you have the ability to consider screening and the solar project was 25' from neighborhood and perched on a hill so it could be viewed by every house in the neighborhood. It would be reasonable to discuss value in the context of other impacts related to the proximity of that solar project to the neighborhood. But standing on its own it's not really regulatable, in his opinion. Otherwise, the Dover Amendment wouldn't exist. Any use next to any other use is likely to impact the value. He's not trying to disregard the concern for it. Again, he's not a strong believer of the way the Dover Amendment is written, but He doesn't think you'd get the necessary horsepower out of your by-law and the statute. For those reasons any other impact through Chapter 44 Section 53G probably would not be a permissible use of Chapter 44 Section 53G. Again, if this was a question of something being within 15-20' or an unreasonably close distant or was related to an issue regarding topography, we could fold in the question of value. This situation may be different. But the mere fact that this is solar and it may affect the value of those homes, and He thought it's unfortunate that it might, it's isn't really grounds for that kind of review.

Mr. Bertozzi asked are we all in agreement as to the impact as to whether our legal counsel has just advised us? Spoke in regards to his opinion on what Mr. Talerman stated.

Ms. Bauman – Echlin stated she was disappointed. Her question was answered.

Mr. Christian Genre of 10 Steber Way was present.

Mr. Genre spoke in favor of the project.

Mr. Albert Sy. Louis 105 Pond Street was present.

Mr. St. Louis stated that he felt that the real estate values would go down because of the proposed 20' fence.

Mr. Cooper stated that in general, the board does what Town Counsel says. Especially when it comes to court cases involving the town. He's not saying it's a final decision.

Mr. St. Louis asked why we have a by-law if we can't enforce it?

Mr. Cooper stated that it's better to have something in such that there are minimum setback, screening and not being able to see it from abutting houses. He understands Mr. St. Louis's frustration. He is trying to explain the board's point of view and Mr. Talerman's point of view.

Ms. Vadnais stated that the board is doing the best they can.

Mr. Cooper stated that the board is trying to work within the powers that they do have in order to come up with a solution that is suitable for the town and the abutters.

Mr. St. Louis stated that rather than having a fabricated fence how about putting in some arborvitaes?

Mr. Kramer explained the reasons for not planting arborvitaes and planting other types of trees and shrubs. Also stated that there has to be some common ground on this project.

Mr. Chris Seal of 5 Marshall way was present.

Mr. Seal asked if the new fence design was approved by fish and game?

Mr. Roach explained that he would reach out to Natural Heritage and ask for their input.

Mr. Seal asked will they check to make sure that the fence will still protect the turtle?

Mr. Roach explained the fact that the fence will be 6" off the ground for safe turtle passage.

Mr. Seal asked if the fence fails who will fix it?

Mr. Cooper explained that the town holds a bond for screening. The towns first option is to always go to the applicant. But can also draw off the bond if needed.

Mr. Seal asked if Mr. Talerman knew how many cases have been won by solar companies compared to how many were lost?

Mr. Talerman stated all of them.

Mr. Seal stated so, solar won in every case?

Mr. Talerman stated there really aren't that many cases, surprisingly, on solar cases. So, across all of the Dover Amendment uses, agricultural, educational, day care facilities, religious and solar, there may be a

handful of cases out of 100s of cases where the proponent of the project didn't win. That doesn't mean that they want to litigate. Sometimes during those cases resolutions happened, where some impacts were reduced. That's not to say that litigation doesn't still have a purpose. There's going to be a solar case where a neighborhood group or municipality wins. That fact pattern is still to be written out there. Mr. Seal asked why can't it be this?

Mr. Talerma stated it potentially could be. I can't tell you what to litigate. If you want to challenge the grant of a decision if that is how the board votes. You could challenge the decision. You have every right to do that. He's not going to make a decision you're not going to hear me counsel this board in public as to the potential ramifications of their actions. Litigation strategies are a private matter that we would discuss. The board hasn't revealed how they're going to vote. Should they take any particular action then He's compelled to defend it. Then that's what he'll do to the best of his ability. That's his job. But he's just giving you the trends in what we see out there in these cases. I've litigated many Dover Amendments cases on behalf of municipalities and my track record is not fantastic.

Ms. Stacy Haskell of 101 Pond Street was present.

Ms. Haskell stated that has the original proposed plan gone through the neighborhood would have been able to see the panels, correct?

Mr. Roach stated that is without considering the vegetation screening.

Ms. Haskell stated that the reason for the 20' netting was so that the 5 of the new sight lines wouldn't see the panels, correct?

Mr. Cooper stated that the original plans came in, were reviewed by our engineer. Our by-law says that abutters shall not see it. It does not say anything about 2nd floors. He was happy that the neighborhood got involved. If you are suggesting that the initial plan as it stood was somehow negligent on the boards part, he didn't feel that was a fair assessment.

Ms. Haskell stated that she didn't understand why the town has a by-law if the state laws supersede it. She felt that the 20' netting against green trees would look horrendous. She thought that the board should go back to the 8' fence, at least it would look as bad. She still couldn't see why the value of their homes would not depreciate. She asked if they could get the selectmen involved and maybe offer the neighborhood some financial assistance?

Mr. Bertozzi stated by all means. It would influence his decision if the Board of Selectmen were willing to litigate this project.

Ms. Haskell stated that she is going to reach out to the Board of Selectmen. She asked that the Planning Board request the applicant to move the project back to the top of the hill.

Mr. Bertozzi stated that the group should make their views on this project known to the Board of Selectmen.

Mr. Bertozzi spoke in regards to himself being a lawyer and his experience with court cases and litigation. Stated that if Town Counsel recommends something to the board on where we might come out with litigation, that we are most likely going to lose, I'm not going to move forward with fighting it. He understood that it is their homes.

Ms. Haskell stated that it is not just our homes. It's the whole town and community.

Mr. Bertozzi agreed. You have heard him say that it needs to be completely screened. The applicant has proposed 20' screening and they feel this will fix the problem of screening. The state does not take into consideration what the conditions are. This is not going to be a situation where we file a law suit and the developer goes away.

Ms. Haskell asked what the likelihoods is of moving the panels on the hill? If the neighborhood couldn't see it then we would be happy.

Mr. Roach stated that Mr. Gioiosa explained to the board that there were reasons for not being able to put it on the hill.

Mr. Gioiosa explained that the project could not be moved onto the hill because it is a protected area for the turtles. We were asked to move it away from that area.

Ms. Haskell asked if it was prohibited to move it?

Mr. Gioiosa explained the Natural Heritage conditioned the project to not be built in that area.
Mr. Mark Carden of the Boy Scouts was present.
Mr. Carden clarified some points made by Ms. Haskell.
Ms. Haskell stated that the turtles are being protected. What about the rest of the wildlife?
Mr. Roach explained that the turtles are a protected species. Explained why they are protected. The stated has determined that the turtles are something that needs to be more protected than other species regarding this particular project.
Ms. Haskell asked if the Boy Scouts of Rhode Island and the Narragansett Council are two separate entities?
Mr. Carden stated yes, they are two separate corporations.
Mr. Mark Haskell of 101 Pond Street was present.
Mr. Haskell asked Mr. Carden if they would be willing to meet with other committees or groups from the town if they were willing to buy the property?
Mr. Carden stated they would be opposed to that. We're not interested in selling the property.
Mr. Chris Seal of 5 Marshall Way was present.
Mr. Seal asked Mr. Talerman about the Dover Amendment and how many solar cases he had litigated as they relate to the Dover Amendment.
Mr. Talerman stated 4 or 5 solar cases. Certainly, proceeded at a board level on several dozen. He had done a lot of educational, religious, and agricultural as well.
Mr. Cooper asked if there were any more questions or comments from the audience; there were none.
Mr. Cooper stated it was his personal opinion that the public hearing should be closed. Asked how the board felt?
Mr. Kramer stated he would like to finalize the situation with the 20' fence and the chain link fence. He'd like to see the material and get an understanding on how it is installed.
Mr. Moitozo stated that if we are still requesting additional information on the fence, can we close?
Mr. Cooper stated we can't close. We would like to see a cut sheet as to the screening material, how much it screens, what it actually looks like when installed. If you have any pictures of what it looks like, in other places, installed.
Mr. Gioiosa stated he would get that for the board. He would also try to get a sample of the material.
Mr. Cooper stated that photos of any installations using similar material would be helpful.
Mr. Bertozzi asked for a copy of the warranties that a manufacture would give with regards to the material. Also, what kind of warranty or guarantee would be provided by the installer.
Ms. Vadnais stated that she agreed with some of the towns people that the 20' fence will not look good. The 20' fence goes against what was previously asked for, natural screening, a natural looking wood fence and it's now being replaced with a mesh screening material.
Mr. Gioiosa stated that he had never been required to look at sight lines from a 2nd story window before. The applicant is happy to go back to the wooden fence and vegetated screening rather than the netting.
Ms. Haskell requested to see the material that Mr. Gioiosa provides to the board on the netting also.
Mr. Cooper stated that is reasonable. Asked Mr. Roach to inform the abutters when he has the information.
Ms. Bauman – Echlin asked if the board was to reject the application on the basis of the town by-law and the applicant appeals the decision because of a state statue, would this be back to the board for reconsideration? Aren't we discussing something that hasn't happened yet? The board needs to make their decision based on the actual by-laws and then if there is an appeal talk about that then?
Mr. Cooper stated he thought she was right. Until the board makes a decision there is no point in discussing litigation.
Mr. Talerman stated no one has suggested that the board shouldn't review this through the leads of the by-law. He just suggested that there are certain parts of the by-law that carried out to the extreme would conflict with state statue. The board has a decision to make and they have a fair amount of discretion to impose some conditions in discussion that. The applicant is willing to work with them. If someone is not happy with the result of the process, they have the right to appeal, that could be the applicant, it could be

the neighbors.

Ms. Bauman – Echlin asked Mr. Talerman in article 4.10.4.5 the board would be working within it's constraints to reject on the basis of the impact to the neighborhood. Wouldn't the burden of proof or burden of appeal be on the applicant instead of the board to support an appeal that hasn't happened yet. Mr. Talerman stated as he's said the boards' ability to deny is very limited. But if an applicant appeals the denial then the burden of proof would absolutely be on the applicant to show that the denial would be inconsistent with state law. It wouldn't be a particularly difficult burden to achieve, but it would be their burden of proof.

Ms. Bauman – Echlin stated that in the meantime it might give both the Planning Board and Board of Selectmen time to have further discussion on the matter. Since it's following a legal process of rejection and then reapplication, if that is the applicant's intent, correct?

Mr. Talerman stated he didn't know about reapplication because if the board overturns it they get the permit. It's not a reapplication.

Ms. Bauman – Echlin stated the appeal rather.

Mr. Talerman stated yes. He gets paid to answer legal questions or to fight how the board chooses to make its decision whether consistent or inconsistent with my opinions is up to the board or the select board. Sometimes towns fight out of principle on things. Sometimes they make decisions based upon what laws says because that's kind of their job. But I can't tell a board what to do at the end of the day.

Ms. Bauman – Echlin – stated is it correct Mr. Talerman that your current advise to the board is to accept the application with stipulations rather than reject it in anticipation of further appeal that you would not be able to litigate successfully?

Mr. Talerman stated that is not his advice. He didn't recall giving that advise, even once today. He's just accessed the risks and benefits of going forward under certain avenues. He didn't tell the board what to do and he wouldn't. He's just assessing what might happen if the board went in any particular direction. He's not handicapping this. He's not making the decision for the board. He's not a policy maker in town he just gives legal advice.

Ms. Bauman – Echlin stated correct. I meant the recommendation.

Mr. Talerman stated he doesn't give them a recommendation.

Mr. Cooper stated that Mr. Talerman was here to explain the Dover Amendment and how it applies to solar specifically. The role of the board here is to make sure the applicant adheres to the rules of the by-law.

The board discussed the screening and the growth of vegetation in order to cover the 20' netting/fence. Mr. Kramer stated that to get to 15' in height it will be at least 5-7 years from what is being installed. His opinion on the fence is to have the wooden fence with the shrubs not the 20' fence/netting.

Mr. Gioiosa requested to continue until February 3, 2021.

New Business

2. Planner Update

Mr. Roach stated there was no update.

3. Substation – Reynolds Ave. – Progress Report

Mr. Roach gave a brief update.

Mr. Cooper asked if there was a specific date for a site walk in the summer?

Mr. Roach stated he would get that to the board.

Ms. Vadnais stated she wanted to be included on the site walk.

4. 2020 Annual Report – Vote to Accept

This item was tabled until the next meeting.

5. Eastwood Estates – Phase I – Roadway Acceptance and As-built

Mr. Roach stated that the as-built for the roadway had been submitted. Fuss & O'Neil is doing their final review.

Meeting Minutes

1. October 21, 2020

Mr. Kramer made a motion to approved the above-named minutes.

Mr. Costa seconded the motion. Roll call vote; all replied aye. Motion passes.

Adjournment

Mr. Moitozo made a motion to adjourn at 10:15 pm

Ms. Vadnais seconded the motion. Roll call vote; all replied aye. Motion passes.

Respectfully Submitted



Christopher Cooper, Chairman

Robert Moitozo, Vice-Chairman