



# City of Lowell - Planning Board

## Planning Board Meeting Minutes

Monday, July 17, 2023 6:30 p.m.

City Council Chamber, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, City Hall

City of Lowell, 375 Merrimack Street, Lowell, MA

Remote Participation Optional via Zoom

**Note: These minutes are not completed verbatim. For a recording of the meeting, visit [www.ltc.org](http://www.ltc.org)**

### Members Present

Thomas Linnehan, Chairman

Gerard Frechette, Vice Chairman

Sinead Gallivan, Associate Member

Allison Dolan-Wilson, Associate Member

### Members Absent

Richard Lockhart, Member

Robert Malavich, Member

Caleb Cheng, Member

### Others Present

Francesca Cigliano, Senior Planner

Dylan Ricker, Associate Planner

A quorum of the Board was present. Chairman Linnehan called the meeting to order at 6:33 pm

### I. Minutes for Approval

4/20/2023 meeting minutes

G. Frechette motioned, and T. Linnehan seconded the motion to approve the April 20, 2023 Meeting Minutes. The motion passed unanimously, (3-0).

6/22/2023 meeting minutes

T. Linnehan motioned, and G. Frechette seconded the motion to approve the June 22, 2023 Meeting Minutes. The motion passed unanimously, (3-0).

## **II. New Business**

### Proposed Zoning Amendment – Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance

The Lowell Planning Board will hold a public hearing to hear all interested persons relative to an ordinance to amend “The Code of Ordinances City of Lowell Massachusetts”, with respect to Chapter 290, thereof entitled “Lowell Zoning Code”. The proposed amendment would amend Article II entitled “Definitions”, add Section 4.3.8 to be entitled “Accessory Dwelling Units”, and amend Article XIII entitled “Table of Accessory Uses” to provide a permitting pathway for Accessory Dwelling Units.

#### On Behalf:

Francesca Cigliano, Senior Planner

F. Cigliano stated the proposal would allow ADUs at single-family residences in Lowell either attached or via the conversion of an existing detached structure, or 10 year old detached structure. F. Cigliano stated ADUs are independent housing units with their own bathroom, kitchen, bedroom. F. Cigliano stated neighboring communities permit ADUs in addition to other MA communities. F. Cigliano said ADUs are intended to increase housing stock, provide diverse housing options, and provide an affordable housing option. F. Cigliano said only 1 zoning district currently allows ADUs, the zoning district only makes up less than 1% of the land in Lowell. F. Cigliano said the ordinance requires ADUs obtain a building permit including proof of ownership, owner occupancy with notarized letter recorded at the Registry of Deeds, floor plans, must obtain Occupancy Permit, and summarized the remaining requirements. F. Cigliano said ADUs would not be allowed on existing multi family, commercial, or mixed use lots. F. Cigliano summarized the requirements and conditions for ADUs under the proposed ordinance.

#### Speaking in Favor:

Thayer Eastman, 53 Fowler Road

T. Eastman said he is in support of ADUs. T. Eastman said he believes everyone, within reason, should be able to use their property as they see fit. T. Eastman said he added a garage with a bedroom above and said City Inspectional Services did a good job ensuring the job was done correctly, and ensured an ADU was not added. T. Eastman said his adult son lives there now to save money due to the rental costs. T. Eastman added that he has an elderly mother-in-law who will eventually live with them. T. Eastman said he believes allowing ADUs is reasonable, and believes Inspectional Services is capable of enforcing the ordinance.

#### Speaking in Opposition:

Bob Hunt, 48 Florence Ave

B. Hunt said he is not opposed to ADUs, and said the proposal is terrible. B. Hunt said his neighborhood organization was not contacted for outreach for the ordinance. B. Hunt said ADUs would be allowed in every neighborhood. B. Hunt expressed concern about the number of bedrooms allowed. B. Hunt said handicap access was not included. B. Hunt expressed concern about not a strict enough off-street parking requirement. B. Hunt expressed concern that there is no LA/DU requirement. B. Hunt said

people should need to live in one of the units full-time. B. Hunt asked that Historic Districts be exempt from ADUs. B. Hunt said the ZBA approves too many projects. B. Hunt said Inspectional Services cannot handle the additional applications.

Donald Denomme, Highlands Neighborhood Association

D. Denomme asked whether there is a max number of people that can occupy an ADU. D. Denomme expressed concern about parking. D. Denomme asked about the requirement not allowing a separate electric or water meter. D. Denomme asked about short-term rentals and what defines short term rentals. D. Denomme expressed concern about the ADU appearance regulation. D. Denomme said he does not think the ADUs will be affordable. D. Denomme said very few ADUs will be built, and said the ADU applications will increase the workload of building inspectors.

James Heller, 54 Parkview Avenue

J. Heller said he is opposed to the proposal. J. Heller said his neighbors had different interpretations of what an ADU is and the ordinance is confusing. J. Heller said he prices out real estate construction for a job, and said ADUs are expensive to construct. J. Heller questioned whether utilities can meet the demands of ADUs. J. Heller noted ADU regulations in other states. J. Heller said Lowell is one of the most dense communities. J. Heller said Lowell should not be the test-study for an ADU ordinance, and said that he looked at different ADU ordinances in different communities.

Deb Forgione, Townsend Ave

D. Forgione provided visuals to the Board members. D. Forgione said nearby communities require Special Permits for ADUs, and said the nearby communities have more land for the units. D. Forgione said enforcement, density, and parking are not adequately addressed. D. Forgione said the surrounding towns are smaller and have larger lot sizes. D. Forgione expressed concern about additional on-street parking. D. Forgione said the ordinance will eradicate single-family zones. D. Forgione said an Special Permit from the Planning Board should be required. D. Forgione said there should be a max number of parking spaces and bedrooms.

Allan Manoian, 49 Tower Drive

A. Manoian said there should be parking maximums so cars are not parked on front lawns. A. Manoian said the Special Permit should come from the Planning Board. A. Manoian said the Planning Board is better suited to issue Special Permits. A. Manoian said Section 5.3.2 not allowing parking in landscaped or usable open space.

William Nickles, 48 Rindo Park Drive

W. Nickles said he is opposed to the ordinance as written. W. Nickles said the permit should be required to come from the owner. W. Nickles expressed concern about enforcement and limits on the number of people that can live in an ADU. W. Nickles expressed concern about paving without an existing driveway. W. Nickles expressed concern about allowing the conversion of a garage to an ADU. W. Nickles expressed concern that detached structures in existence for 10 years can then be converted to an ADU. W. Nickles expressed concern about the impact on flood zones. W. Nickles asked if there would be a time frame for the City to review a permit. W. Nickles said the Special Permit should go before the Planning Board not Zoning Board of Appeals.

Pat Vondel, 60 Lamb Street

P. Vondel said the ordinance is disrespectful to the citizens of Lowell. P. Vondel asked whether research has been done to determine whether ADUs increase affordable housing. P. Vondel expressed concern about the cost to rent units.

Lynn Daly, 35 Linwood Road

L. Daly expressed concern about dimensional requirements, and rent prices for ADUs. L. Daly said the ordinance lacks these details.

Curtis Lemay, 40 Robert Street

C. Lemay said the ordinance will create problems, and said there is too much oversight required. C. Lemay said students have displaced many residents in Pawtucketville when UML expanded. C. Lemay expressed concern about the lack of available parking. C. Lemay expressed concern about density.

Gail Fracee, 29 Tolman Ave

G. Frace expressed concern about open space requirements and congestion. G. Frace expressed concern about snow removal and emergency vehicle access.

Allan Saber, 30 Dunbar Ave

A. Saber expressed concern about not addressing concerns from those opposed to the ordinance. A. Saber said the ordinance will not resolve the housing crisis. A. Saber said he used to live in a multi-family neighborhood, and expressed concern about renters. A. Saber said Inspectional Services cannot handle the additional workload. A. Saber said the number of cars in the neighborhood will triple. A. Saber said the city will lose federal funding if they don't try to pass this and said the neighborhood will look like a multi-family neighborhood.

Nancy Judge, 28 Foch Street

N. Judge asked the Planning Board send back the ordinance for edits.

Steve Marassy, 36 Humphrey St

S. Marassy said he is opposed to the ordinance. S. Marassy said it will eliminate single-family zones and ruin single-family zones.

Discussion:

G. Frechette said there were 4 subcommittee meetings. G. Frechette said that multiple kitchens/bathrooms are allowed as long as it is free flowing with the whole unit. G. Frechette said there hasn't been a lot of analysis related to the City of Lowell. G. Frechette said that the Zoning Board of Appeals can grant a Variance providing an exception to the conditions under the ordinance. G. Frechette said there are setbacks under the table of dimensional requirements. G. Frechette said the ordinance is not very restrictive. G. Frechette said many communities started strict then relaxed the regulations because there were not many ADUs permitted. G. Frechette noted the Council will make the final decision and noted the proposal only requires a simple-majority. G. Frechette said there are differences between Salem's ADU ordinance and the proposed ordinance. G. Frechette said there should be a parking maximum because this would require too many cars in driveways.

F. Cigliano said there is no design review. G. Frechette expressed concern. F. Cigliano noted if the ADU was in a Historic District it would be subject to design review from the Historic Board and would need to follow floodplain regulations for new developments if in the floodplain.

G. Frechette asked about how the regulations would be enforced upon sale of a property with ADUs. F. Cigliano explained how the ordinance would be enforced.

G. Frechette asked about the definition of short-term rentals, F. Cigliano noted this is defined in the City general ordinance, and a short-term rentals is one which is rented for less than 30 days.

G. Frechette asked about lot coverage requirements. F. Cigliano stated this is regulated within the Zoning Ordinance, and the max it could be is 25% of the floor area of the home. G. Frechette said a larger unit could be done with a Special Permit. G. Frechette said the ordinance will create rental units, and said it should be restricted to relatives and caregivers. G. Frechette expressed concern about allowing detached ADUs.

S. Gallivan said she is supportive of expanding ADUs in Lowell but is not supportive of the ordinance. S. Gallivan said she is concerned about increasing density. S. Gallivan suggested being more restrictive would be reasonable, not allowing non-conforming lots able to apply for ADUs. S. Gallivan said she is opposed.

A. Dolan-Wilson said she is opposed. A. Dolan-Wilson explained why she was opposed.

T. Linnehan said he had concerns. T. Linnehan expressed concern about density. T. Linnehan said there are differences between surrounding towns and cities and Lowell. T. Linnehan said he believes ADUs should not be by-right. T. Linnehan said there would no longer be single-family zones. T. Linnehan said it is expensive and makes housing more expensive.

Motion:

G. Frechette motioned to issue a negative recommendation stating the following reasons:

- (1) Density concerns;
- (2) Concerns with by-right construction;
- (3) Parking maximum and minimum concerns;
- (4) Lot size requirements;
- (5) Concerns with detached ADUs; and
- (6) Concerns that a design element should be included.

S. Gallivan seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, (4-0).

Definitive Subdivision – 330 Princeton Boulevard, 01851

The Lowell Planning Board will hold a public hearing to hear all interested persons relative to an application by Edson Dos Santos for the property at 330 Princeton Boulevard. The subject property is located in the Traditional Two-Family (TTF) zoning district. The applicant is seeking to subdivide the existing lot, and construct a two-family dwelling on the newly created lot. The newly created lot will not meet the minimum frontage requirement pursuant Section 5.1 of the Lowell Zoning Ordinance. The project requires Definitive Subdivision approval from the Lowell Planning Board under Lowell's Subdivision of Land Regulations.

On Behalf:

Nick Landry, Applicant's Representative

Speaking in Favor:

None

Speaking in Opposition:

None

Discussion:

G. Frechette said he did not see a sign posted at the site. T. Linnehan asked the applicant if a sign was posted at the site. N. Landry said no sign was posted on the property.

Motion:

G. Frechette motioned, and S. Gallivan seconded the motion to continue the application to the August 21, 2023 Planning Board meeting. The motion passed unanimously, (4-0).

Site Plan Review and Special Permit – 17 Burns Street, 01852

The Lowell Planning Board will hold a public hearing to hear all interested persons relative to an application by Jose Herrera at 17 Burns Street. The applicant is seeking to convert the existing structure from a 4-family residential structure to a 6-family residential structure. The subject property is located in the Traditional Multi-Family (TMF) zoning district. The proposal requires Site Plan Review approval from the Lowell Planning Board per Section 11.4 for the conversion of a structure with more than 3 dwelling units, and Special Permit approval from the Lowell Planning Board per Section 11.3 and Article 12.1 for a 6-unit residential structure.

On Behalf:

Agui DeSouza, Applicant's Representative

A. DeSouza said the main issue is the project will not meet the parking requirement which they will go before the ZBA for relief for. A. DeSouza said the applicant is seeking to invest in and improve the property. A. DeSouza explained the proposal. A. DeSouza said they can fit 6 off-street parking spaces, 1 for each unit. A. DeSouza said no curbcut would be needed.

Speaking in Favor:

None

Speaking in Opposition:

None

Discussion:

T. Linnehan read an abutter's testimony into the record from John McDonough.

T. Linnehan said staff submitted comments with concerns about the parking layout. T. Linnehan noted staff comments and the items requested by staff.

T. Linnehan noted the concerns about the parking plan. A. DeSouza said they would need ZBA relief.

S. Gallivan said concerns regarding the parking plan should be addressed. S. Gallivan requested an existing and proposed plan to show the proposals. S. Gallivan requested information regarding how the stormwater requirement will be met.

A. DeSouza said the building will remain in the same footprint.

G. Frechette asked if the applicant is seeking a decision or a continuance. A. DeSouza said if changes are needed he will request a continuance.

T. Linnehan expressed concern about the parking area. A. DeSouza said he would request a continuance to address concerns. T. Linnehan said he has concerns about the density and lack of parking.

S. Gallivan said if the applicant's intention is to have 0 parking spaces he may move forward tonight, but if not he may wish to request a continuance. A. DeSouza said he would revise the plans.

G. Frechette clarified that the ZBA grants the relief. G. Frechette said they are looking for revised plans and noted the plans are inadequate.

T. Linnehan said if more than 6 spots can't be provided then he would be opposed to the application.

A. DeSouza requested a continuance to explain the situation to the applicant. A. DeSouza agreed to continue to 9/7.

Motion:

T. Linnehan motioned, and S. Gallivan seconded the motion to continue the application to the September 7, 2023 Planning Board meeting. The motion passed unanimously, (4-0).

**III. Continued Business**

Site Plan Review – 21 Christman Avenue, 01852

The Lowell Planning Board will hold a public hearing to hear all interested persons relative to an application by Landsmart, LLC to construct and operate a Veteran's Education and Housing Facility at 21 Christman Avenue. The proposed facility will include classrooms, meeting space, an associated office, and 12 temporary residential units. The subject property is located in the Traditional Single-Family (TSF) zoning district. The proposal requires Site Plan Review approval per Section 11.4 to construct greater than 3 residential units.

On Behalf:

Douglas Deschenes, Applicant's Representative

D. Deschenes summarized the proposal. D. Deschenes said they are exempt from zoning as it is going forth under the Dover Amendment, but still require Site Plan Review. D. Deschenes said there will 12 SROs and classroom space. D. Deschenes said these will be available to Veterans involved in the programs. D. Deschenes said he expects the units to be temporary for no more than 90 days with up to a year in extreme cases.

Jason Gilber, ClearPath for Veterans

J. Gilber said they provide supportive and educational services to veterans and their families. J. Gilber said they will provide these services at this location for veterans residing in the building. J. Gilber said he

was previously a homeless veteran and the programs are important. J. Gilber said they serve vets in need of services and it is important for veterans to advocate for other vets in need.

Randy Carter, ClearPath for Veterans

R. Carter said they are a non-profit serving veterans. R. Carter said Lowell is one of the areas deemed most in need by the State for veterans housing/services. R. Carter said this is not a halfway house. R. Carter said the program will help veterans and will be tailored to the needs of the veterans. R. Carter said the building is staffed 24 hours with curfew for the veterans (10pm). R. Carter said they serve veterans in need.

Matt Hamor, Applicant's Engineer

M. Hamor said the lot is 16,000 sf which has an existing single-family home. M. Hamor summarized the slope of the lot and existing conditions. M. Hamor said they are proposing to demolish the existing home and construct the new structure. M. Hamor said the driveway entrance is across from the 495 on-ramp. M. Hamor said there are 21 off-street parking spaces. M. Hamor explained revisions to the plan including landscaping, a formal area for snow storage. M. Hamor said a new solid fence would be erected and 20 arbor vitae along the rear of the property for screening. M. Hamor said there is drainage on site, and said soil testing has been completed on the site. M. Hamor said they are addressing the stormwater teams requirements. M. Hamor said shade trees will be added.

M. Hamor explained the proposed floor plans and noted there will be an internal trash room which will be picked up privately. M. Hamor said the SROs are approx. 370sf in size with bathrooms in each individual unit. M. Hamor explained the elevations.

D. Deschenes said the proposal meets the zoning requirement for the parking. D. Deschenes said residents will be required to attend classes and participate in programs. D. Deschenes said there would be 1-3 programs per day. D. Deschenes said most residents will not own vehicles, and said at other facilities they would estimate 2-3 residents would have cars. D. Deschenes added some residents may work or attend school while living there. D. Deschenes said the parking far exceeds their anticipated need. D. Deschenes said the facility will be staffed 24/7. D. Deschenes said most veterans coming to this facility will be coming from other ClearPath facilities and would be shuttled there for programming, and added some of their residents may be shuttles off-site for certain programs. D. Deschenes said there is an LRTA bus stop nearby on Woburn St & Christman St intersection. D. Deschenes said veterans in the facility are vetted and drugs and alcohol are not allowed. D. Deschenes noted the City Transportation Engineer opined on their proposal saying they would not impact traffic on the street.

Speaking in Favor:

None

Speaking in Opposition:

Doreen Botano, 28 Jean Ave

D. Botano said this is not about not-in-my-backyard. D. Botano said she supports veterans, but this location is a bad location for veterans. D. Botano expressed concern that there is not a large enough trash storage area. D. Botano said there isn't a walkable path to public transportation. D. Botano said there needs to be a clear path to the public transportation. D. Botano expressed concern about nearby



sidewalks. D. Botano said there don't appear to be accommodations to allow the veterans to walk through the neighborhood. D. Botano expressed concern about parking and traffic. D. Botano expressed concern about snow removal. D. Botano expressed concern about headlights shining into her home.

Julie Costello, 33-35 Christman Avenue

J. Costello said she lives to the left of the home. J. Costello said there are water issues in the neighborhood. J. Costello said she is concerned about snow storage areas melting and inundating her property with water. J. Costello noted that some classes will not be on-site. J. Costello said she asked for an 8 foot fence, but it looks like a 6 foot fence. J. Costello said there are not amenities nearby. J. Costello said there is not enough space for outdoor space. J. Costello said there is nowhere for the veterans to play outside.

Luke Brissard, Neighbor

L. Brissard said his concern is traffic and safety. L. Brissard said there is a lot of traffic at the site. L. Brissard said they would like an independent traffic and safety study done.

Pat Brissard, Neighbor

P. Brissard asked if Board members have been to the site. T. Linnehan confirmed he visited the site. P. Brissard said the programs are great, but it's a bad location for veterans. P. Brissard said she'd like an independent traffic study. P. Brissard said there is a lot of traffic on the site.

Amy Searles, 76 Bowden Street

A. Searles said she is not opposed to veterans, but expressed concern about parking. A. Searles noted there is a daycare across the street too. A. Searles said it is a bad location for veterans.

Jeff Thomas, 76 Bowden Street

J. Thomas said the property is not zoned for this use. J. Thomas said it doesn't fit the neighborhood. J. Thomas said he loves veterans. J. Thomas said he would put it in his backyard if it was allowed. J. Thomas expressed concern about the number of people coming in from other facilities. J. Thomas said the neighborhood is a single-family neighborhood. J. Thomas said this belongs somewhere else.

Joanne Dolan, 37 Jean Avenue

J. Dolan said she supports the veterans but not this. J. Dolan said she is concerned about density. J. Dolan expressed concern about the property being sold.

Kim Scott, 27 Commonwealth Ave

K. Scott said the area is zoned single-family and said the applicant is using the dover amendment to circumvent zoning. K. Scott said the applicant is just trying to maximize the use of the property. K. Scott said the building is too large and expressed concern about drainage. K. Scott said there are not amenities nearby. K. Scott expressed concern with traffic. K. Scott expressed concern about garbage. K. Scott said there is precedence to deny the project.

Erik Gitschier

E. Gitschier said he's not a NIMBY. E. Gitschier said contractors are trying to takeover the City. E. Gitschier said ClearPath is being used by the applicant. E. Gitschier said the City cares about veterans and cited ceremonies at City Hall. E. Gitschier said the veteran representing ClearPath should be ashamed of himself. E. Gitschier expressed concern about stormwater runoff.

David McDonald, 33 Jean Ave

D. McDibakd said his concern is the maintenance of the property, and said there are rats on the property. D. McDonald expressed concern about traffic safety. D. McDonald asked if bathrooms are ADA compliant. D. McDonald asked if there are criminal background checks.

Discussion:

J. Gilber said he was a formerly homeless veteran and said he understands their concerns, and explained his comments about NIMBYism. J. Gilber said the programming is tailored to veterans residing at the site so they can't come up with a schedule yet. J. Gilber said he will provide schedules once available. J. Gilber said typically the veterans do not have cars, and veterans are background checked by the VA. J. Gilber said no vet with a serious criminal history would be allowed at the site. J. Gilber said they are here to support their vets.

D. Deschenes said the barrels are industrial size not typical sized. D. Deschenes said they will have private trash pick up so they can have their trash collected more frequently. D. Deschenes said they will ensure sanitary issues are addressed. D. Deschenes said the sidewalk is an issue, but said they do not own the sidewalk, it is the City's responsibility. D. Deschenes said the applicant could work with the City to improve the sidewalk. D. Deschenes noted there is a curfew so there will be little to no traffic after 10pm. D. Deschenes said they would provide an 8 foot fence for neighbors. D. Deschenes said one neighbor had a preference for vegetation. D. Deschenes said they will meet the City and state stormwater runoff requirements and said the system is designed to catch the water that lands on the parking lot. D. Deschenes said with correct engineering there will not be flooding. D. Deschenes said they will obtain a stormwater permit from the City. D. Deschenes said there is enough space for outdoor space for vets on the site. D. Deschenes said they would accept a condition of no on-street parking. D. Deschenes said their goal is to integrate residents into life. D. Deschenes said they have more than enough parking and will not create traffic. D. Deschenes noted the Board must review the application for the Site Plan Review requirements.

D. Deschenes said info related to the programs offered are listed in their application, but they do not have a defined schedule yet.

T. Linnehan said the applicant should provide the information on classes and schedules. J. Gilber explained the types of classes. D. Deschenes said they met with the neighbors and read through potential programs but ClearPath was unable to attend. D. Deschenes said he is here to ensure the proposal will meet all of the City's Site Plan Review requirements. D. Deschenes said he did not tell ClearPath not to speak to neighbors.

J. Gilber said he spoke with neighbors but neighbors were asking questions related to the development so he declined to answer questions until the meeting.

A. Dolan-Wilson asked about permanent lighting in the parking area. M. Hamor said the parking area will not have tall lights, just downward facing lighting for the entrances on both sides of the building. A.

Dolan-Wilson asked if it was permanent. M. Hamor said it would be dark sky and downward facing. M. Hamor said they can revise the site plan to revise this.

T. Linnehan asked about the sidewalk in front of the building. M. Hamor said there would be a new sidewalk going to sidewalk on the lot, and said they would add a handicap accessible ramp by the curb cut. T. Linnehan asked if there would be a new sidewalk, M. Hamor said they would make improvements in coordination with the Engineering Dept. M. Hamor said they could provide a new sidewalk in front of the site if needed. M. Hamor said it depends on the Engineering Dept decision.

S. Gallivan asked a condition be included to require a stormwater permit from City and the sidewalk be replaced up to city standards to be ADA accessible. S. Gallivan said her primary concern is that the building does not derogate from the surrounding neighborhood. S. Gallivan expressed concern with the elevations.

M. Hamor said he can provide further analysis of the neighborhood, and said they can speak with the architect regarding the elevations and said he could provide a lighting plan.

D. Deschenes said they would like an opportunity to revise the plans, and provide the lighting plan. D. Deschenes requested a continuance to address the concerns.

M. Hamor clarified a stormwater permit is issued at time of construction.

S. Gallivan asked if the Board would like an independent traffic analysis. S. Gallivan said she does not think it is necessary and trusts the City Transportation Engineer. S. Gallivan asked about the applicant having a community meeting. D. Deschenes said they would meet with the community.

Motion:

T. Linnehan motioned, and S. Gallivan seconded the motion to continue the application to the August 21, 2023 Planning Board meeting. The motion passed unanimously, (3-0).

IV. **Other Business**

V. **Notices**

VI. **Further Comments from Planning Board Members**

G. Frechette said NMCOG is working on a strategic plan for the organization.

S. Gallivan said the application for the CPA is closing in September and the applications are open.

VII. **Adjournment**

T. Linnehan motioned and G. Frechette seconded the motion to adjourn. The motion passed unanimously (4-0) and the time was 10:47PM.