

PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
August 8, 2017

7:00PM

Senior Center

Members Present: John Michalak, Rob Ricker, Otto Lies, Scott Carlson, Tina Stratis, Jeff Head, William Ritter

Others Present: Pam Harding, Director of Planning
Liz Fotos, Town Recorder

J. Michalak called the meeting to order at 7:04PM

P. Harding introduced Mark St. Fleur and stated that he started recently at DPW as the new Town Civil Engineer.

PUBLIC HEARING DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION- TORREY LANE – CUL DE SAC- 4 LOTS- BOYLSTON CP, LLC

J. Michalak read the public hearing notice into record.

John Grenier, J.M. Grenier Associates and Jim Haynes, Boylston C.P. LLC were present on behalf of Boylston CP.

J. Grenier stated that the subdivision they were proposing was on the south end of Torey Lane, south of Hawthorne Road. He stated that there was currently a handful of homes that front Torey Lane and that there is no turnaround on the existing street. He stated that what they were proposing was to extend Torey Lane with a cul de sac that would give frontage to their four new lots. He stated that they were before the ZBA in order to have duplex approved and that they met all the frontage requirements to do so. He stated that they would be before the ZBA for their second hearing in September as the ZBA did not have a full Board for the initial hearing. He stated that they do have adequate turnaround and adequate frontage. He stated that they were proposing drainage in what was the easterly portion of lot 4 in order to accommodate run off from the new homes. He stated that they received comments back from Engineering and they were in the process of addressing some of those comments but that nothing would just with the design of the subdivision; the changes would be technical.

J. Grenier stated that they did an abutter meeting with the ZBA and one of the things to come out of the meeting was to shift the detention pond to have a little separate. He stated that they also proposed a split rail fence but that there was children around so they will go with what was required under the Subdivision Control Regulations; the 4ft chain link fence. He stated that they also did test pits and there was good sandy pervious soils so there was not issue with depth to ground water. He stated that they would be looking to service with Town water and sewer and that they would be speaking with the Water Department to confirm that there was adequate pressure to service the development.

J. Grenier stated that another comment they received was to reduce the pavement to 24FT. He stated that they do not have an issue with that. He stated that they were proposing sidewalks on one side of the street and that he wanted to revisit this comment down the line as he wanted to look at the location of the existing sidewalks so they could make it best fit with the neighborhood.

J. Grenier stated that the other item that was requested during the ZBA process was for lots 4/5 to combine the access point for one single driveway and then split for two garages so the number of curb cuts to be reduced.

J. Grenier stated that he believes that they addressed most major topics. He stated that he believes this is an improvement to Torey Lane as right now it is a blunt dead end and for emergency vehicles there is no turnaround. He asked if anyone had any questions.

J. Michalak asked for Town Comment.

P. Harding stated that they had touched on most of the items. She stated that an abutter did submit in writing opposing the location of the detention pond and the applicant stated that they would move it north. She stated that the Town had asked for the sidewalks to be extended in order to have greater connectivity and that they requested the one driveway to reduce curb cuts.

J. Michalak asked the public if there were any questions or concerns.

Mark Fullen, 36 Sandy Glen Drive was present at the meeting. He stated that this was behind his house and that there was some concerns with stuffing eight families with sixteen cars in that space. He stated that additionally on trash days there would be 16 barrels out and it was close quarters. He stated that he looked at the condos on the other side and they were more spread out. He asked if they could put a fence across the back property line as well. M. Fullen stated that he does not think that duplexes were maintained as well as single family residences and felt that there was going to be issues down the road.

Linda Connor, Torey Lane was present. She asked if they would be rented or sol.

J. Grenier replied they would be sold.

Mike Santoro, 24 Vista Circle stated that one of the things that is nice is the wooded area and wildlife. He stated it would be unfortunate to lose that experience.

M. Fullen asked if it was possible to put single family homes in that area.

J. Michalak replied that single family homes were not the plans in front of the Board.

P. Harding stated that in order to explain the process; this was for the insulation of the cul de sac. She stated that in zoning they created enough frontage to comply with duplexes. She stated that

if the ZBA denies the special permit request for duplexes, they can construct single family homes without coming back to the Planning Board.

M. Fullen asked if duplexes needed a special permit to get what was required; he asked why the special permit was needed.

P. Harding replied that it was in the R-10 zoning that allowed duplexes by Special Permit, not by right. She stated that ZBA looked at the applications on a case by case basis to see if it was fitting in with the neighborhood.

R. Ricker stated that they were combining two lots on the right for one curb cut; he asked about doing the same thing on the left.

J. Grenier replied that there were not the four curb cuts on the left, so it didn't make sense to do it there.

S. Carlson asked if on the deeper houses they were doing single driveways.

J. Grenier replied that on the left there was not distance.

W. Ritter asked if they could move the garages to the center of the buildings to eliminate any issues.

J. Grenier stated that they would have to look into it because it would be a different design with different flood plans.

R. Ricker asked about the trees that were proposed.

J. Grenier stated that one of the concerns was for cars coming down the lane with light spilling into the homes. He stated that they put a row of arbovitore trees there to help screen the light.

M. Fullen asked if there was anything that could go behind the lots as a buffer.

J. Grenier replied they were not opposed to doing something.

T. Stratis asked if DPW spoke about the island in the cul de sac.

P. Harding replied that they would like to see the island because the area to store snow is limited.

R. Ricker asked how many feet the center of the cul de sac was.

J. Grenier stated it was less than 500ft.

T. Stratis asked if the fire department had issues with the configuration.

P. Harding replied that the fire department had not commented yet.

R. Ricker asked if the Town had any issues with the waivers.

P. Harding replied she did not.

S. Carlson asked if the single driveway was requested by the developer or the Town.

P. Harding replied that DPW wanted it.

R. Ricker stated that the ZBA would be in charge of this matter because they were determining if they were allowing duplexes.

W. Ritter asked if the Board could wait for ZBA's decision in order to see what type of homes they were looking at.

P. Harding stated that ZBA would be meeting on September 21, 2017.

O. Lies stated that he was uncomfortable with the turnaround and asked if they could explain the single driveway again.

P. Harding stated that the application was submitted to the ZBA and that once DPW looked at it they asked for the curb cuts to be reduced creating a single driveway; 6 curb cuts rather than 7.

O. Lies asked if DPW was requesting a center to the cul de sac because there was no room for snow removal.

P. Harding stated there was limited room.

O. Lies stated that he thought this was a poor design.

J. Grenier stated that they could look at altering the unit style.

Fred Connor, Torey Lane asked how much property the developer owned. He stated that he was trying to develop such a small area. He stated that if they do duplex' there will be two different people on the same driveway, he asked how that would work if you don't get along with your neighbor.

J. Grenier stated that was what was being considered.

F. Connor stated that it did not seem logical; he asked if there was additional property.

J. Grenier stated that the total acreage was 5.6 acres. He stated that some of the land was not suitable to develop but was practical for drainage.

F. Connor stated they should eliminated the duplexes and build homes so they were not congesting a small area. He stated that were trying to put too much in one small area.

T. Stratis asked if they anticipated clearing land to the detention pond and then leaving the rest untouched.

J. Grenier agreed.

M. Fullen asked if it would be one or two car garages.

J. Grenier replied that it varied depending on the width.

M. Fullen replied that everyone has two cars, one car garage with a shared driveway would cause issues.

F. Connor stated that they were not allowed to park on the streets either.

W. Ritter asked if they could move the infiltrations north.

J. Grenier stated that they could look at it; he stated that they were trying to give the neighbors 20-30ft of wooded area and not disturb the trees.

W. Ritter stated that it looked like they could go a little more than that.

J. Grenier replied that they previously had a detention basin and an abutter at 5 Torey Lane did not want the basin too close either so they were looking to find a happy medium.

R. Ricker asked if they could shift it.

J. Grenier stated that they want it going north to work with the grade of the land. He stated that with the pavement reducing they can see if they can reduce the size of the basin as well.

T. Stratis asked if the existing width of Torey Lane was 24ft.

J. Grenier stated that it varied but that 24ft was consistent with the existing street.

T. Stratis asked if they were doing the 24ft with one sidewalk.

J. Grenier replied that was what they felt made the most sense. He stated that as far as sidewalks went he wanted to revisit the site in order to ensure that how they tie the sidewalks in made the most sense.

R. Ricker asked if they were extending the sidewalks to Hawthorne.

J. Grenier replied that was what was requested and they were not opposed to it.

W. Ritter asked if they could hold off and see what ZBA was going to approve. He stated that driveways were part of the Planning Board's purview and once they have an answer from the

ZBA then they can look at infiltration issues and they will know what exactly was being proposed to build.

O. Lies asked if ZBA was asking the Boards recommendation.

P. Harding stated that the Planning Board does not make a recommendation because this matter was before them as well. She stated that if there was a specific comment that the Board has it could be forwarded to their attention.

P. Harding stated that she would be opposed to driveways side by side as it would look like a roadway into a house.

M. Fullen asked what the width was of a single driveway.

P. Harding replied 12ft which was why they could not be side by side.

J. Michalak asked what the driveways were drawn at.

J. Grenier replied 16ft but they could bring it down to 12ft and then flair it to 16ft.

T. Stratis asked if this was an HOA.

J. Grenier replied it was an individual HOA for the lots.

P. Harding stated that there was engineering revisions to be made as well.

J. Grenier stated that they addressed most of the engineering issues at this point.

Motion by W. Ritter, seconded by J. Head, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO APPROVE THE DEVELOPERS WRITTEN REQUEST TO CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR DEFINITVE SUBDIVISION- TORREY LANE – CUL DE SAC- 4 LOTS- BOYLSTON CP, LLC TO SEPTEMBER 26, 2017 WITH A TIME PERIOD TO FILE TO OCTOBER 5, 2017.

PUBLIC HEARING- SITE PLAN/ SPECIAL PERMIT-DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISON- 351 BULLARD STREET- HOLDEN YOUTH SOCCER

W. Ritter recused himself at 7:45PM.

J. Michalak read the public hearing notice into record.

Larry Green and Bill Donahue were present for Holden Soccer.

L. Green showed the plans to the Board. He stated that the site that they were talking about was about 12 acres in size and slopes high to low. He stated that within the 12 acres they were proposing 2 athletic fields, shown in light green, interior parking lots for 111 spaces, two way traffic as it access the site, signage, speed bumps, key pans for entry from staff, police, fire, Mayo Staff etc. and they were proposing night lighting that was low level for residents. He

stated they were also proposing two outbuilding; a utility building, for nets, storage and maybe concessions down the line and then an out building for rain or someplace people could cool off or get out of the rain. He stated that there would be nets around the front so balls don't go into the parking lot and a fence so kids would not be chasing balls into the wetlands.

L. Green stated that regarding stormwater, they would be mimicking the patter of high to low. He stated that they were currently working with Con Com as well regarding this matter.

L. Green stated that because they were on a school campus they wanted to created a nature trail to connect the two out door spaces so if teachers wanted to use the space or for a future garden area as well.

L. Green stated that they had commissioned a proposal for the traffic study so while that was pending he would not have too many answers on that matter.

P. Harding stated that most of the concerns were with regards to stormwater. She stated that the fire department had asked for a hydrant to be installed and HYS had agreed to locate one at the beginning of the site. She stated there was a Zone A issue that the applicant had resolved and they were also waiting on the traffic study.

J. Michalak opened up the hearing for public comment.

Bob Collins, 471 Bullard Street stated that on the first field there is a buffer however there is another corner on the site and it was not accommodated in the same way. He stated that some of the abutters were not present at the meeting but wonder if it was appropriate to put the arbivious trees on the other corner as well making them go all around. He stated that they had agreed to do it for the one that bought them (HYS) to court but why not do it for all.

L. Green stated that the distance was different which was why it was not initially put on the plan but that they could possibly entertain that.

R. Ricker there was not any subterranean drop; he stated that the houses were higher than the fields.

L. Green agreed and said there as about 30ft of grade change but adding trees for screening was not out of the question.

Sharon Collins, 471 Bullard Street stated that they were at the bottom of the vernal pool and they were concerned with the noise level. She stated that it was going to be so noisy. She stated that she is also concerned for the nature and the animals. She stated that her sister was certifying that it was in fact a vernal pool and that she was concerned about chemicals that were used and everything running into the wetlands.

L. Green stated that they were still working on and would have to submit and O&M Plan. He stated that they were pro-environment and were sensitive to those concerns. He stated that the whole infrastructure will drain to the detention pond where there is stormwater treatment. He

stated that they can work on screening to help with the noise as well. He stated that HYS was willing to work to manage the time too so that noise was not a huge issue.

R. Ricker asked if there was use after dark.

L. Green replied there was not.

P. Harding stated that it was until 8pm and that in the agreement that lights were permitted.

S. Collins asked what happened if the lights did not go off. She stated that down the line things could change and then could be a snack bar and restrooms, etc. She asked if they could be notified and updated through the process.

L. Green stated that as part of the legal decision, lights would need to be shut off by 8:30PM. He stated that they were showing the locations of the fixtures but they would still need approval on them.

J. Donahue stated that the way it worked was that lights would go off on the field first and then in the parking lot after to allow for people to leave the fields safely.

J. Head asked if there was a lot of spill over for lighting.

R. Ricker stated that it would all be down on a lower grade as well

L. Green stated that in the parking lot it was 12ft soft lights with no abutter spillage.

T. Stratis asked if Mountview had any issues with their lights.

P. Harding stated that there were no complaints.

T. Stratis asked about the walkway.

L. Green stated that there was an existing path off Bullard that they would connect to.

T. Stratis asked about handicap parking.

L. Green showed her the locations of it on the plans.

Karen Miller, 491 Bullard Street stated that it was built for soccer but she was also hearing about flag football, etc. She stated with multiple activities going on traffic was going to be an issue.

B. Donahue, HYS stated that they would be working on scheduling to accommodate this concern.

S. Collins asked if they were actually going to do that.

B. Donahue replied that the neighbors were a big concern and they were trying to be good neighbors. He stated that they take it very seriously and they were not trying to ruin anyone's life.

K. Miller asked how they measured noise levels and how far it would travel.

L. Green replied he did not know the science behind that.

S. Collins stated that they can hear echoes of bats, kids playing, whistles, parents yelling. She stated it was going to be a problem.

B. Donahue stated that there was proposed signs regarding respecting the neighbors and as a Board they send out emails to parents to trying to have them know scream/ cheer as much at the fields.

S. Collins asked what the outcome of the litigation was.

B. Donahue replied that as part of the agreement they lowered the fields to aid with noise.

T. Stratis asked about the retaining wall and if they would be maintaining it after.

L. Green stated that they would be maintaining them.

S. Collins asked if they would think about doing something on the other fields corner to help too.

L. Green replied that it sloped down but that they could do plantings on the up side of the slope too.

Tom Heinold, 378 Malden Street, asked what the elevation difference was.

L. Green replied 12ft.

T. Heinold asked where Malden Street was in reference to the plans.

L. Green showed him.

J. Michalak asked if there was any designated spaces for spectators.

L. Green showed where spectators could watch from but stated that there were no bleachers.

S. Collins asked if they were planning on doing tournaments at these fields.

B. Donahue replied they were.

S. Collins stated that they said they would not be doing that.

B. Donahue stated that in the future they would like to host but they would need to get neighbor approval.

S. Collins asked if that was true. She stated that they were talking about renting it out to other entities, she stated they don't want it rented.

P. Harding stated that as it is stated now, HYS, Mayo School, and the Town of Holden are the only ones that are allowed to use it.

S. Carlson asked if the field could be used for lacrosse.

B. Donahue replied it could be.

R. Ricker asked if they were using artificial turf.

B. Donahue stated they would like to down the line.

J. Head asked if the entire site was fenced in.

L. Green showed the Board where it was fenced.

T. Stratis asked about the electric fence and who would have the codes.

L. Green replied that HYS, Mayo School, the Town, and Emergency Personnel.

Mike Miller, 491 Bullard Street asked if this matter was still being reviewed by the Conservation Commission and what they were reviewing.

L. Green stated that the Conservation Commission reviews all work within 100ft of a wetlands.

M. Miller asked if the area where the two fields were was considered wetlands.

L. Green replied it was not. He stated that the NOI evaluated the site design and confirmed the wetland area.

M. Miller stated that it was standing water all year round and he was surprised it was not wetlands.

L. Green replied that they commissioned someone to do the wetland review.

R. Ricker asked when they anticipated ground breaking.

B. Donahue replied that they were working on year 6 of the project; he stated that if they get approved then they can start to speak with companies and get a time frame.

L. Green stated that there were some grants that that they could look at as well but they were not eligible for them until they got local approval.

O. Lies asked how many parking spots they had.

L. Green replied that they had 111 on site and 67 overflow.

O. Lies stated that the overflow was from the school, he asked if there was parking on the access road.

L. Green confirmed there would not be.

R. Ricker asked if they had any idea when they would have the traffic study.

L. Green stated he hoped soon.

B. Donahue stated that they had contacted Green International that did a 2014 Traffic Study on Bullard and they were hopeful that they will work with HYS in order to conduct the study again. He stated that they would not be able to do the study until school started to obtain the correct information as well.

R. Ricker stated there should be a traffic study from Mayo as well.

P. Harding replied that Wachusett Valley Estates would have done one as well.

S. Collins asked if the neighbors would have been aware of it.

P. Harding replied it was a public document but no notification would have gone out.

P. Harding stated that there were revisions that needed to be made for the drainage, there was the traffic study, and the addition of a hydrant.

J. Michalak suggested continuing the matter until a future meeting.

S. Carlson asked if there were restrooms.

P. Harding stated that there was a E-1 system and a manhole to connect but initially it would be with the portable toilets.

M. Miller asked about the three buildings.

L. Green stated that one of the buildings shown was a shell/ pavilion used for shelter.

I McCauley, Senior Civil Engineer, DPW was present. She stated that there were existing sidewalks that run along Mayo, she asked if they could connect the sidewalks to the new drive.

L. Green replied it was connected.

I McCauley asked if the basin could be considered a bio retention in order to go more with the character of the land.

L. Green replied he would speak to his engineer about that.

S. Collins asked about their standings with the Conservation Commission and what was happening with the DEP.

L. Green replied that regarding the DEP they were considered in a Zone A and that was getting removed. He stated they wanted a test hole so they did that and they were currently working with DEP in order to remove that designation.

R. Ricker asked what the Conservation Commission's timeframe was.

P. Harding stated that the next hearing was on September 6, 2017.

Linda Conner stated that her concern was the noise level and the future possibilities of tournaments being held. She stated that she understands that they are saying that they will ask the neighbors but they are only one member of a committee of 14 and in the years to come with turnover was this going to be the same sentiment passed along.

B. Donahue stated that the ZBA stated that there was no tournament style weekend play.

L. Conner stated that a one day tournament would be allowed.

B. Donahue replied yes.

R. Ricker stated that in the future there probably would be but if it was limited and controlled then it should be controllable, he stated to say there would not be any tournaments would be unrealistic.

L. Connor asked how they would control it, people parked on Bullard for school events.

R. Ricker stated that the whole issue was going to be for the site plan to spell out the limitations and look to control every aspect. He stated they would be looking at the worst case scenario.

S. Collins stated that the comparison of the facilities was in Princeton and Lancaster and neither was in a residential area. She stated she does not think this is the right area for this project.

R. Ricker stated that the site plan was not to say if it was happening or not happening it was just to control it.

T. Heinold asked who did the controls on this project.

R. Ricker replied ZBA. He stated that they do timing, lighting, elimination of a field, etc. He stated that the Planning Board makes sure that traffic was safe and there were places to park. He stated that a lot of this had already gone through.

M. Miller asked where the field was that was eliminated.

L. Green showed the location.

A resident asked what the traffic study would provide them.

J. Michalak stated that it would determine the anticipated volume of traffic, would give input on parking spaces to see if what was there was adequate and then would set restrictions for no parking and signage and give recommendations to help enforce these rules.

L. Green stated it would evaluate Bullard Street as well.

S. Carlson asked when they did the report what was the amount of vehicles per day.

M. Miller stated 180 turning over a few times per day.

B. Donahue stated that was not what they anticipated.

P. Harding stated that there were engineering standards that they would use. She stated there was a certain could and a metric in place that would be applied to existing traffic reports.

J. Michalak stated they would compare peak traffic with rush hour etc and look at the worse case scenario and the average for the day.

A resident asked what happens if they determined the flow to be too high.

J. Michalak stated that they may request a turn light but that he does not think that is what is going to happen.

S. Collins asked about sidewalks.

J. Michalak stated that DPW would address sidewalks and connectivity.

S. Collins stated there were no sidewalks on the left of Bullard Street.

J. Head asked about Davis Hill and how many fields there were there.

B. Donahue stated that there were about 4/5 and it is used from 8am to 4pm.

J. Head asked how many games were played.

B. Donahue stated that it was often 4v4 so it could be 6 games.

An unnamed resident asked how they determined 111 spaces, he stated that at the peak he thought they needed 160 spaces.

L. Green stated that the average on a team is about 10/11 kids plus a coach and ref so about 25/30 per field.

B. Donahue stated that they do take into consideration the larger teams. He stated that with two games, 20 per team so 40 or 80 for two fields. He stated that scheduling would be taken into consideration as well.

P. Harding stated that the traffic study will look at the flow and the parking spaces as well.

J. Michalak asked if HYS had regular Board Meetings and if there was any way that they could add some sort of neighborhood liaison to bring some information back to the Board.

B. Donahue stated that there is a list on their website and that they were looking for volunteers.

J. Michalak stated that HYS was expressing a willingness to work with the neighbors.

S. Collins stated that it didn't matte because the same thing happened when Mayo was built. She stated now the street is too busy with traffic and the new developments etc. She stated that was not supposed to happen and that no one remembers what they promised the neighbors. She stated this was going to make it worse.

O. Lies asked what assurance they can give the neighbors and Town that this will be maintained the way they envision it.

B. Donahue stated that the only way he could answer that was for people to look at what HYS is and has been. He stated they have always taken care of the fields they use, from putting the field in at Mountview, to up keeping the field and making sure everything is cleaned up. He stated all they can tell the neighbors is that HYS is a well run organization and if they did not care about the community they would not have the support of so many families.

Motion by J. Head, seconded by R. Ricker, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO ACCEPT THE WRITTEN REQUEST FROM THE APPLICANT TO EXTEND THE PUBLIC HEARING TO SEPTEMBER 26, 2017 WITH THE DECISION TO FILE TO OCTOBER 10, 2017 FOR 351 BULLARD STREET/ HOLDEN YOUTH SOCCER.

STONEYBROOK ESTATES- BOND REDUCTION

P. Harding stated that the information was distributed at the last meeting. She stated that bond items were for work not completed, not maintenance.

Motion by R. Ricker, seconded by J. Head, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO APPROVE THE BOND REDUCTIONS AS PRESENTED ON MEMO ENTITLED:STONEY BROOK

BOND REDUCTION ALL PHASES AND DATED JULY 18, 2017 SHOWING THE FOLLOWING REDUCTIONS:

- PHASE I: INCREASE FROM \$61,821.24 TO \$71,436.06
- PHASE IIA: REDUCED FROM \$4,764.44 TO \$3,122.05
- PHASE IIB: INCREASED FROM \$34,242.96 TO \$43,054.06
- PHASE III: REDUCED FROM \$59,138.80 TO \$19,662.45
- PHASE IV: REDUCED FROM \$14,281.33 TO \$6,915.76
- PHASE V: REDUCED FROM \$45,993.95 TO \$5,937.07

APPROVAL NOT REQUIRED- 238 BAILEY ROAD-R-40 KOHLSTROM LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT

P. Harding stated that they were taking the back portion off the parcel and joining to the other.

Motion by J. Head, seconded by T. Stratis, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO APPROVE ANR FOR 238 BAILEY ROAD R-40 KOHLSTROM LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT.

UNION STREET GREENSTONE PROPERTIES- R-1 ZONING DISTRICT ASSESSING MAP 118 PARCEL 36

P. Harding stated that this was for septic.

Motion by T. Stratis, seconded by R. Ricker, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO APPROVE ANR UNION STREET/ GREENSTONE PROPERTIES R-1 ZONING DISTRICT ASSESSING MAP 118 PARCEL 36.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Approval of Meeting Minutes was continued to the next meeting.

MISC

S. Carlson asked for the running count on houses.

P. Harding replied that she would provide it to the Board.

Motion by T. Stratis, seconded by S. Carlson, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO ADJOURN THE AUGUST 8, 2017 PLANNING BOARD MEETING AT 9:02PM.

APPROVED: _____

