



approved
11/26/19

Town of Carver, Office of Planning and Community Development

Planning Board Meeting Minutes, November 5, 2019, Carver Town Hall, Meeting Room #1. This meeting was videotaped by cable cast area 58, channel 15.1

Attendees: Bruce Maki, Chairman; William Sinclair, Member; Kevin Robinson, Member; James HJen Bogart, Member; James Hoffman, Member; Kelli DiCarli, Alternate Member Kevin Robinson

Also Present: Jim Walsh, Planning Director; Andy Glimes, Fuss and O'Neil

Absent:

Bruce Maki, Chairman, opened the meeting at 7:11 7:00 PM, followed by the pledge of allegiance.

ANR:

Federal Road (Map 131, Lots 1-2A, 1-2B and 1-2C) AD Makepeace – Receipt of Plans

We will look at this at our next meeting, November 26, 2019.

Approval of rear lot:

Church Street (Map 8, Lot 14) – Discussion and possible approval of rear lot

Mr. Walsh – This is an auction property that the treasurer sold off. One of the requirements is to have the Building Commissioner review. Mr. Walsh read the Building Commissioners Letter to the Board. It meets all requirements for a rear lot but needs approval from the Planning Board. The applicant wanted to come to the Board as they would like a fast closing.

Ann Creed (Friend of owner) – I was under the impression that it was a buildable lot when we went to the auction. Mr. Francis told me that he thought it would be okay; I can't help Matty buy the lot if it's not buildable. He is just going to build the house for him and his family. I only have two weeks to purchase.

Mr. Maki – The only plan we have is the Assessors map? Mr. Walsh – Correct. Mr. Maki – They haven't surveyed for years. Mr. Sinclair – I sat on the TOPS committee for many years. When we looked at these properties, these lots were picked out of the Assessors maps. These lots went through all the legal aspects to go to auction. The Building Commissioner is looking for clarification of whether it meets the requirements for a rear lot, which it does. Mr. Maki – It would have to have some sort of survey if they want to put a house on it. They have quite a bit of frontage, almost double that is required. It also has more than the required 3 acres. Mr. Sinclair – This wouldn't have made it to auction if it didn't meet requirements.

Donna Forand 27-8, South Meadow Village – This property used to be my grandparents. There were 9 relatives in the family. The attorney that handled the estate, did not include this property in the estate and my father found out too late. It has a lot of history to me and I would love to see a house put there.

Motion to recommend as a buildable lot for a single family dwelling: Mr. Robinson

Second: Mr. Sinclair

Approved: Unanimous (5-0)

Public Hearings (continued):

- On the application of NextSun Energy, LLC, requesting a Special Permit and Site Plan Review pursuant to Sections 3100, 3580.60 and 5300 of the Carver Zoning by-Law, located at 0, 0R, 60 Rochester Road, Carver, MA (Assessors Map 92, Lots 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 22) to allow the construction and operation of a dual use, large ground mounted solar photovoltaic installation (LSGMSPI) and appurtenant equipment and interconnection in accordance with the solar by-Law in a Residential/Agricultural District.

Mr. Maki – We did a site visit and closed the public hearing at our last meeting. We are waiting on the decision which is included in the packet. Mr. Walsh – Yes, you have the one with all the changes in it. Mr. Walsh read the conditions to the members.

Mr. Walsh read the eleven Conditions to the Board.

Mr. Maki – Any questions or comments?

Ms. Bogart – Condition #2 – The decommissioning bond – I'd love to see a specific number. We also may want someone to analyze it all as there is a lot of inconsistency. Ms. Stearns – In all of the projects I've worked on they have all been different; typically, it's a third party engineer. This one is not ready yet which is why you don't have the number. Jim and I have been working on the language. Ms. Bogart – We may want all applicants to use the same third party. Mr. Maki – We can take a look at that. Mr. Hoffman – #5 clearing limits marked – BEFORE anything is cleared we will be notified? Mr. Walsh – That's correct, we could also utilize Fuss and O'Neil for that. Mr. Hoffman – 9B – Maintenance agreement – if it's not kept up, how do we handle that? Mr. Walsh – The last condition (11) states that the company has to notify us of any changes regarding who to contact or ownership changes. Mr. Maki – 9B – There were some places that we were going to do some plantings that was discussed with the neighbors. Should something be stated that abutters need to approve? Ms. Stearns – We were proposing plantings off our site but it is commonly owned. The applicant agreed to any landscaping requests from abutters. There are a couple of areas that we are looking at for fencing (solid and evergreen). This has all been reviewed by Fuss and O'Neil and is on the plan. Mr. Maki – It will all be inspected at the end in order to issue a certificate of occupancy. Ms. Stearns – You updated the date of the plan? Mr. Walsh – Yes, October 9, 2019.

No other questions heard. No comments from audience as public hearing was closed at the last meeting.

Motion to approve the application for NextSun Energy, LLC for 60 Rochester Road: Mr. Hoffman

Second: Mr. Sinclair

Approved: 4-1 (Ms. Bogart)

- On the application of Borrego Solar Systems, Inc., requesting a Special Permit and Site Plan Review pursuant to sections 3100, 3580 and 5300 of the Carver Zoning by-Law, located at 19C Ward Street (Assessors Map 120, Lot 6 and 6-1) in Carver, MA, to allow the construction of a 2.5 MW(DC) ground mounted solar and energy storage facility in accordance with the by-law in a Residential/Agricultural District.

Dean Smith, Borrego – This is a new phase of an existing project. We will have to build an entire new system with an interconnection. The setbacks have been reduced; I want to make sure that we are clear on their application. The plan we showed was a 12.5' setback, but that is for dual use. We aren't proposing a dual use. Mr. Maki – When I viewed from Ward Street, the solar project is way out on the property and barely visible. Mr. Smith – The Fire Department has reviewed this plan set. There is a lot of existing vegetation; it is well screened. Mr. Maki – The new project is surrounded by existing field as well as bogs? Mr. Smith – Correct. We are proposing a 2.5 MW addition. There is an energy storage component involved in this phase; the first phase did not. There will be a single light at the equipment area – 8' post, led light that is shielded and cast downward. There is very little call for someone to be there after dark. There will be a short extension to the driveway.

Ms. Bogart – Are there any poles involved? Mr. Smith – Yes, at the north end; I believe there are four. Mr. Sinclair – The energy storage component, can you explain? Mr. Smith – They are in an enclosure; they are lithium ION and single cell enclosed, module enclosed and rack enclosed. Jesse Boyle from the fire department has attended a lot of training on this. He did make some comments on this project. It is equipped with a number of safety features. Gas Detection, temp control monitor. Mr. Sinclair – The internal fire component, what do you use to put out? Mr. Smith – I believe it is Novec 1200. Mr. Sinclair – I want to see the details plus containment. I have asked for this with any type of storage in the past. We are an aquifer and we need to know what the chemical is and what you are going to do with it. Mr. Smith – I will get that information. Mr. Hoffman – This new proposal is due to new setback requirements. Mr. Smith showed the Board the plan set. Mr. Smith – All of the bog roads are shared with multiple owners and the property lines are a little strange. Mr. Hoffman – Everything abutting your proposal is a bog? Mr. Smith – Yes. Mr. Hoffman – Is this near the airport? Mr. Smith – Yes, less than a mile north. We did do a glare study with no concern.

Audience comments?

Cornelius Shea – I was curious about containment and recovery in a catastrophic failure. Mr. Maki – The fire department looks at this closely; we will get that information.

Dagmar Ryan, 14 Lillian Way – What is the lifecycle of the materials/panels? Mr. Smith we start with 20-year lease with 5 year renewals we project 30 years. We would plan decommissioning at that time. We included costs for that and it would be bonded. We would return it to its original state.

Liz Taylor – 31 Russell Trufant Rd. – The technology is changing by leaps and bounds; how long until new technology? Mr. Smith – Because of the cost of a project like this, we wouldn't "upgrade" for a very long time. Ms. Taylor – Is there a risk that your company would not take care of the project if it was no longer worth it?

During the decommissioning process, where do they go? Mr. Smith – These modules are solid silicon and there isn't a lot that would be recyclable. As more are built there will be more material to recycle. There are studies that have been done on this type of modules; damaged panels were placed in a pit and there was no leeching. I would be happy to provide you with a copy of the study.

Nick Tuberosa, 5B Snappit Road – decommissioning and surety bond – Is it an annual bond? Mr. Smith – That would be specified by the Town. It is usually a performance bond. The system owner would be responsible for paying that. Mr. Tuberosa – What happens when you go out of business; who pays the insurance bond? Mr. Smith – That would be something to raise to your planning board. Mr. Tuberosa – All of these solar companies are fairly new; when they decommission it, a few years from now the new company may not be here. I hope none of your companies go out of business. We are going to be called "Solar Town" now, not "Cranberry Land". There has to be financial assurance. Mr. Smith – Your Board can assure that happens. Mr. Walsh – It's similar to a subdivision. I can check into it some more. Mr. Maki – I believe we are covered for decommissioning; it is on the cranberry owner's land, if something happens they would be responsible. Mr. Tuberosa – The reason they are doing this in the first place, is because they don't have money

David Savastano – 8 Snappit Road – Why doesn't Kingston allow it? Mr. Sinclair – you would have to ask them. Mr. Shanahan – My company has two projects there. Ms. Stearns – They have specific renewable energy districts. Large scale are specific districts.

Colby Whipple, 5 Ward Street – I can see the existing solar array from my house, how tall is the new one? Mr. Smith – The same as the existing.

Cornelius Shea – The bylaws have changed; does that allow abutters to talk about screening? Mr. Maki – We are going to go for a site walk; after we can discuss screening. Mr. Sinclair – It's a good question. This is a brand new application; everything is on the table. Mr. Shea – People surrounding these projects are having second thoughts. Mr. Sinclair – When bylaws change, it will give abutters a new opportunity. Mr. Maki – Yes, we will treat it as a new project. We will schedule a site visit. We can get concerns addressed at the next meeting.

Mr. Maki – The bogs are clearly marked? Mr. Smith – I would be happy to be there when the Board walks it to guide you or answer any questions. Mr. Maki – This is Kelli DiCarli's first night. You are included in the site walk and can ask any questions.

Mr. Sinclair – Regarding Site Walk, I will be out of town until 11/25. Mr. Maki – Can we all do it on 11/25? I will be in and out until then. Ms. DiCarli – I could do it but not until 4:30. Let's say that if the majority can do it the 25th, we can get Ms. DiCarli another time.

We can park in front of 5 Ward Street. Mr. Smith – I will have someone put a sign up.

Liz Taylor - Where are the homes located on the map? Mr. Smith noted on the map where the resident's homes are located. What would prohibit you to moving this project to the other side? Mr. Smith – This is the property owner's preference and the other side is still a working bog. This is not a dual use array. Ms. Taylor – What was the previous setback? Mr. Smith – 200'.

The Board has scheduled a majority site walk on November 25, 2019 at 9:00 AM. Mr. Smith will reach out to Ms. DiCarli to schedule a separate visit.

Motion to continue the public hearing for Borrego Solar Systems, Inc. for 19C Ward Street, to November 26, 2019 at 7:00

PM: Mr. Sinclair

Second: Mr. Hoffman

Approved: Unanimous (5-0)

Public Hearings:

- On the application of Clean Energy Co., Joe Shanahan, requesting a Special Permit and Site Plan Review pursuant to Sections 2230, 3100, 3580 and 5300 of the Carver Zoning by-Law, located at 0 Snapit Road (Assessors Map 34, Lot 2 and 5 and Map 33, Lot 9-C) in Carver, MA to allow the construction of a 2.0 MW dual use, large-scale ground mounted solar photovoltaic project proposed to be constructed and operated on and in conjunction with the existing active cranberry bogs in a Residential/Agricultural District.

Mr. Shanahan – Real Estate Permitting – Clean Energy Co is a Colorado based company and has been in existence for about 7 years. I am based out of Worcester, Ma. We have done 38 projects over the last 5 years. The site is 41 acres; we are proposing to use about 11 acres. Our facility would pretty much duplicate anything you've heard in prior dual use projects. We will have lithium ion. Your Fire Department is probably the most up to date with handling these. In regard to decommissioning, we contracted an engineer who stated \$71,500 for costs, which is \$91,000 less \$20K for salvage \$. This will cost \$4.1 mil to build, it is a very valuable asset. If our company went out of business, the assess doesn't disappear or shutdown. No one is going to walk away from this valuable of an asset, someone will pick it up. These projects must have a plan and assurity. If we let our bond laps, your officer can pull the plug. The bond is renewed every year (we do it at 10 months). Regarding containment and recovery – we will submit details for you. The site is remote with excellent screening. There is one beautiful property, Mr. and Mrs. Perry, that it will affect. We can come to an agreement. Some of this will have to go before the Conservation Commission. Rich Tabaczyuski, Atlantic Design Engineer - I have an aerial view for you. This was presented to the Board. Two separate arrays due to a perennial stream that runs through the site. We kept the panels outside of the 100' area that has been identified. There will be overhead utility crossings, with 5 poles. Access will be through the existing bog road. The storage systems will be enclosed and located as far away from property lines as possible. We maintained the 200' set backs from the West and East. We maintained the 25' setback to the south which is owned by AD Makepeace. A letter has been provided from them accepting that reduced setback. The site is cleared; we are not proposing grading, tree clearing or storm water management.

Ms. Bogart – Are the bogs wet or dry harvested? Mr. Shanahan – Wet. Ms. Bogart – Fixed or tracking? Mr. Shanahan – Fixed. Mr. Maki – I went out to this site via James Breech Way. I saw that there was one house (the Perry house) near the project, with no screening. We will have to take a site walk there. We will have to talk more about screening. Mr. Shanahan – I walked the site several times. The Perry's have a beautiful property; right now there is a strong stand of trees 25-30' with a gap to the Perry Property. I am very sensitive to the issue and am prepared to propose more than would typically be done. Because of the elevation of the property, 4' arborvitaes wont make sense. Our planting plan proposes 22' trees and 16-18 giant arborvitaes. Unfortunately, that would lose their view of the bog. The solar facility faces the opposite direction. I hope to reach common

ground. Mr. Sinclair – You talked about a decommission estimate of \$91K but you took a \$20K reduction. Mr. Shanahan – If you add in dumpsters, labor, equipment rental, operators, etc., it adds up to \$91K. Your by-law allows us to take a credit. If you deduct salvage you get \$71K. I anticipate you bump that to your 125%. Mr. Sinclair – The letter from AD Makepeace – This gives you that they don't have a problem for that. Will that be a waiver for the setback? Mr. Shanahan – Your by law already reads that the setback is 25'. Mr. Hoffman – Dual use is new. The applicant mentioned that the minimum height of the panel is 8'. What is top height? Mr. Shanahan – About 12'. Mr. Shanahan – Dual Use came about by the Cape Cod Cranberry Growers and Beacon Hill, along with the DEP and the Department of Energy coming together and deciding dual use made sense. Then they got together with UMass Amherst. Mr. Shanahan – There are some detailed reporting requirements to maintain this status. If we don't maintain that active grower's status, we are in violation of the Wetland Protection Act.

Audience Comments/Questions

Mr. Tuberosa, 5B Snappit Road – Jim mentioned conditions in the decision. I heard fire apparatus – road needs to be wide enough? I don't think it currently meets that. It can't get from Snappit onto that Use road. Mr. Maki – Each one of these projects is reviewed by the Fire Department, very thoroughly. They will make sure that roads are made to support the equipment. Mr. Tuberosa – One of the other conditions mentioned screening – The person responsible is the property owner? Landscaping usually means mowing lawns, etc., Now we are talking 21' trees. What happens with an act of god? Who would be responsible for replacing fallen trees. In some cases, screening is not done; according to bylaw 3580.25.1 Mr. Tuberosa read paragraph 3 for the Members and the audience. The Perry's have a two story house. It should be considered in any screening. Mr. Shanahan – We have developed a plan specific to the Perry Property. We hired a landscape architect. As far as an act of god taking down one of my trees; unless the Planning Board started requiring applicants to post bond on this, it's a bit of a roll of the dice. What I could do; I've got estimates on all of the plantings, I can post a 3 - year cash bond to replace any tree(s) that doesn't survive. I can't post it for the life of the tree though. Mr. Tuberosa – But it's a requirement of the bylaw; you should keep the screening in place for 25 years. Ms. Bogart – To your point, Section 3850.25.1 does say that all plantings shall be maintained throughout the projects life and replaced when necessary. Mr. Shanahan – I believe that it would pass to the owner of the property. The Building Commissioner could go back to the owner and hold them responsible. Mr. Maki – Jim, could you look into that. Mr. Shanahan – Nothing is worse than arborvitae. I have in other projects, posted a cash bond to cover that. If we don't do it, the Town has the money to do it. Mr. Maki – We had a similar project last year. The applicant offered to do the planting but also offered to give money to the abutter. In this case, the applicant took the money.

Liz Taylor, Russell Trufant Road – In the bylaws is it written that they can accept cash rather than planting? They have a panoramic deck on a beautiful home; a 21' tree would not mask the issue. Mr. Maki – We will do a site walk and have discussion over this.

Liz Taylor – The reduction in decommissioning. The cost for recycling is cost prohibitive. I don't think the \$20K reduction is realistic. What happens when we have 11 acres of solar panels that we can't do anything with. There are components that are not recyclable! To take a \$20K reduction doesn't make sense. Is the bond a current year rate or future inflation rate? Are we accounting for a 3% cost per year increase over the years? Mr. Shanahan – regarding salvage number – I didn't come up with that number. It is not the panels, it is the lithium ion, etc. If

you determine that you don't want to give us salvage value, I can live with that. There is a recommendation to review the bond every 5 years but we could do it annually if required.

David Stafsano – Snappit Road – Are there any oil based transformers to boost line voltage up to the grid? Mr. Shanahan – No How does it connect up to the grid. Mr. Shanahan – There is an interconnect but no booster. What is the voltage? How does it increase the line voltage? Mr. Shanahan – I will check on that.

Nicole Perry, Snappit Road – Is there any research saying dual use works? They don't get sun to turn red. Mr. Shanahan – This is a brand new concept. We are making a huge capital investment. There is underlying risk. Ms. Perry – Are there any others in town? Mr. Maki – There is a mock one that we have in Town; its been up for about a year. We did our first harvest this year. Mr. Walsh – The state had done research as well as the cranberry industry. We don't have the actual reports. Ms. Perry – We need to research this. If I covered my house in solar, it would reduce value. University of Mass has no research yet. How about broccoli? Mr. Tuberosa – Cranberries need sun to turn red. Mr. Maki – The cranberries grew at the mock bog. Ms. Perry – You don't have proof. How does it compare to last year? No one is going to want to live here. Invest money into the research. Mr. Maki – The Planning Board can only follow the zoning by laws. If residents feel that the by laws need to be changed, you can make proposals. Mr. Walsh – That process starts at the Town Clerks office. Ms. Perry – Can this be put on hold? Mr. Sinclair – We have to look at it today, based on the bylaws in place right now. We have to gather information to make that decision. You couldn't put on hold unless the applicant withdraws without prejudice. Mr. Walsh – By statute, we are required to make decisions with certain time limits. Mr. Maki – We have to make sure screening is according to the by-Law. Ms. Bogart – How would you feel looking out at the arborvitaes/trees? Robert Perry – We did go to the conservation meeting; they keep talking about guidelines/standards to meet. Who oversee these guidelines re: production? Is it production or quality? A lot of people are worried about the color. Are we just talking volume or are we talking usable quality berries? Who oversees this? Mr. Sinclair – What I have read so far, under the new solar incentive for dual use, all it says that I've read is that it has to be a harvestable crop. It doesn't say color or quantity either. This was set out by the state, not this local board. Mr. Perry – I thought it was 50%? Mr. Shanahan – Limits of shading is 50%. Mr. Perry – I thought there was a standard. Who sets the standard on what's an active bog? As a town, helping cranberry growers, now we are into the residential areas for panels, which I think is a mistake. My house is about 50' above the bog, from the second story. I am not opposed to solar but we need to slow it down to get it under control. If I am looking at trees as opposed to the bog, I don't know. I am a reasonable person. I came here hoping to get some answers. Mr. Sinclair – I don't have the answers you are looking for. This new incentive is new to us to. We are going to try to adhere to the current local bylaw. We don't waiver. Your screening issue will be a major process. Every application is different. You have a very unique, beautiful house. We will see it when we go out to do a site visit. Screening will have to be addressed. We are trying to adapt existing bylaw to the new incentive program. This will probably be updated at the next town meeting. Everything that you bring to us will help us. Mr. Maki – I can understand your concerns. I think you need to have a conversation with Mr. Shanahan. Mr. Perry – Absolutely. Mr. Maki – This is a major issue; if you weren't happy, something would have to happen. As far as the production of cranberries, it does not fall to us. You should reach out to the state. Mr. Sinclair – I will look into who for you. Ms. Bogart – At a prior meeting, we were told that it's at the state discretion, with the state doing random audits. Not every project will be looked at every year.

Nicole Tully – 162 Center St. – If the application is submitted now and doesn't get approved and then the bylaws get change in April, what bylaws apply? Mr. Sinclair – It's based on what the by laws are today. We have a time

limit that this Board must make a determination. If the application fails, the applicant can appeal. If he comes back in 2-3 years with a similar project, he goes by those bylaws. Ms. Tully - Does the board have the ability to make determination that the bylaws are not specific enough to govern a particular situation? Mr. Sinclair - We do not; we have to go by the by laws set by this community. Mr. Shanahan - This person is suggesting that this Board is acting on something that they have never seen before, but you have. Ms. Tully - This is from a community perspective. The blue book was based on community knowledge at that time. Mr. Sinclair - This is how we determine things to bring to the Town Meeting. We could have gone against the by-laws and said no, the applicant would file suit and we'd pay thousands in court fees and still lose. We have to adhere to the current by laws. Mr. Hoffman - There is a bylaw re: dual use from the last town meeting. As Mr. Sinclair said, if it has to be tweaked, Town Meeting is the time to do it. Ms. Tully - As the community learns more and maybe changes the by laws, how do we handle a project that is already in motion. Mr. Hoffman - We represent the people of the town. Every case is different and it's important to get you feedback. Thank you for coming tonight. Ms. Bogart - 3580.60 - One of the conditions (#3) is supposed to be met.

Savery Moore, 12 S. Main Street - The zoning by laws on the website are a year and half old. If you are seeing something that doesn't mention dual use, it is an outdated version. From the Town warrant last April, the by law does say 100% screening shall be obtained from street grade or yard grade. It doesn't say anything about the top of the house; you may be looking at older by laws. Mr. Walsh - There is a process of appeal. That period has ended. The Town Clerk has now consolidated and now they will at some point be put into the regular bylaws. You can get a copy from the Town Clerks office.

David Stafsano - Snappit Road - What is a harvestable crop? Mr. Maki - That has nothing to do with the Planning Board. You would have to contact the state and ask for their requirements. Mr. Shanahan - I could submit the regulations to you.

Liz Taylor - Set back required from the property line to screening? Would it be 100'? Mr. Maki - We would have to look at topography, etc. Mr. Shanahan - There is no setback from screening. Mr. Maki - Usually screening is on applicant's property but it could be placed on the abutters property

Nick Tuberosa - 5B Snappit Rd - I would hope that all the boards are as concerned as we are with the states monitoring of this. There has to be some concern as to what the state is going to do. Are they going to assure that the farmers are going to do what they are supposed to do? I am uncomfortable with anything the state is monitoring. Mr. Maki - The growers have to be concerned too; they do have to sell their crop. Mr. Tuberosa - We didn't say they had to sell it. Sun and heat go through plywood at our test location but it will not go through solar panels. Mr. Maki - We can find out more about this program. It is a state issue.

Liz Taylor, 31 Russell Trufant Rd - The abutter is AD Makepeace? Variance? Mr. Shanahan - Letter of no objection. Ms. Taylor - there was an article including Dick Ward. They are looking to do it on quite a few of their bogs. Mr. Maki - The state put out the program. Ms. Taylor - I think that we should hold on a bit and there could be money incentive? Mr. Shanahan - There is no "quid pro quo". Mr. Maki - I would never go against the by laws for set backs unless all parties agreed upon it.

Mr. Maki - Let's schedule a site visit. Perhaps we can do both on the same day (11/25). Ms. Bogart - Can Ms. Perry be available so that we take a look from the property? Ms. Perry - Yes, I will be there. Mr. Shanahan - I

would suggest coming in by James Breech Way. Mr. Maki – The first walk is 9:00 AM; and this one at 10:00 with the option to come early if done with the first one.

We will meet at James Breech Way at 10:00 AM on 11/25.

Motion to continue the Public Hearing for Clean Energy Co, to November 26, 2019 at 7:00 PM: Mr. Hoffman

Second: Mr. Robinson

Approved: Unanimous (5-0)

Other Business

Planning Board Member Notes:

- Ms. Bogart –
- Mr. Robinson –
- Mr. Maki –
- Mr. Hoffman –
-
- Mr. Sinclair – I attended the North Carver Water District Meeting, last night. The Commission has entered into an agreement with an applicant for a water extension project. I have no update on the Rte. 44 project. I hope to have something at our next meeting.

Planning Director Notes:

Mr. Walsh -

- I have copies of the bylaws for this Board. Cara Dahill is working on consolidating the existing bylaws.
- Renewal of Bed & Breakfast – 78 Rochester Road, Jacob Braley. The certificate of inspection was required. It was inspected and does have the certificate.

Motion to approve the special permit for another year for 78 Rochester Road: Mr. Sinclair

Second: Mr. Hoffman

Approved: Unanimous (5-0)

To make improvement of the water sources for the Fire Department. Annually, the Fire Department does the ISO requirements. They can now provide letters to residents for insurance companies to provide discounts on insurance.

Motion to recommend the MVP Program for incentive: Mr. Sinclair

Second: Mr. Robinson

Approved: Unanimous (5-0)

- Edit wording on Tremont Street Solar Decision – This is on hold for now.

Minutes of October 22, 2019

Discussion – October 22, 2019

Motion to table the minutes of October 22, 2019, as written: Mr. Sinclair

Second: Mr. Hoffman

Approved: Unanimous (5-0)

Next Meeting date:

Our next meeting will be on November 26, 2019 at 7:00 PM

Adjournment:

Motion made to adjourn at 10:05 PM: Mr. SinclairSinclair

Second: Mr. Robinson

Approved: Unanimous (5-0)