

**Town of Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
Location: 580 High Street
March 12, 2008
7:30 PM**

Board Members Present: Chairman Robert Malster, Robert Moore, Steve Olanoff, and Bruce Montgomery.

Board Members Absent: Henry Gale

Staff Members Present: Nora Loughnane, Town Planner; and Peter Alpert, Esq., Ropes & Gray; Michael Jaillet, Executive Secretary; Chris McKeown, Project Manager for Westwood Station; Gareth Orsmond, Esq., Rackemann Sawyer.

Chairman Malster opened the meeting at approximately 7:35 p.m.

Public Hearing: Proposed Zoning Amendment Articles

Chairman Malster opened the public hearing with a reading of the legal notice. Mr. Malster informed the public that the Board would not be taking up the article concerning a proposed amendment to the affordable housing requirements within Mixed Use Overlay Districts this evening. Mr. Malster stated that the Planning Board was awaiting further information relating to the proposed amendment from the Board of Selectmen. He further explained that this article is closely tied to the Development Agreement for Westwood Station, which is still incomplete. Mr. Malster said that the Planning Board would continue this public hearing to March 19, 2008 at 7:30 p.m., and would schedule a joint meeting with the Board of Selectmen just prior to that hearing, to further discuss the proposed affordable housing requirement article.

Mr. Malster began the review of the Proposed Zoning Amendments.

Article 1:

To see if the Town will vote to amend Section 6.3 [ENCLOSURE, SCREENING AND BUFFERS] 1) to insert the words "Screening Standards" after the number "6.3.9" so that the section title reads as "Screening Standards Special Permit"; 2) to insert a new Section 6.3.10 that reads as follows, or take any other action in relation thereto:

"6.3.10 Perimeter Fence Special Permit. The Board of Appeals may grant a special permit to install a freestanding fence a maximum of eight (8) feet in height, or a fence attached to a wall with a combined height of a maximum of eight (8) feet in height, measured from the lowest point of grade adjacent to the fence or wall attached to the fence, on a lot line only upon its written determination that the adverse effects of the project will not outweigh its beneficial impacts on the Town or the neighborhood, in view of the particular characteristics of the site, and of the project in relation to the site. In addition to any specific factors that may be set forth in this Bylaw, the determination shall include consideration of each of the following:

- 6.3.10.1 degree to which existing landscaping, vegetation and other screening will be maintained;**
- 6.3.10.2 proximity to abutting residences;**

6.3.10.3 proximity to heavily traveled roadways; and

6.3.10.4 consistency with the interests of public safety, particularly sight distances for traffic visibility.”;

3) to amend Section 2 [DEFINITIONS] definition of “Structure” to delete the second sentence in its entirety and replace it as follows so that the definition of “Structure” reads as follows and redesignating others to maintain appropriate alphabetical order, or take any other action in relation thereto:

“Structure An assembly of materials forming a construction for occupancy or use including among others, buildings, stadiums, gospel and circus tents, reviewing stands, platforms, staging, observation towers, communication towers, flag poles, water tanks, trestles, piers, wharfs, open sheds, coal bins, shelters, fences and display signs, tanks in excess of 500 gallons used for the storage of any fluid other than water and swimming pools. A freestanding fence or wall six (6) feet or less in height, or a fence attached to a wall (other than a retaining wall as defined in the Massachusetts Building Code as amended from time to time) with a combined height of six (6) feet or less, measured from the lowest point of grade adjacent to the fence or wall attached to the fence, will not be considered a structure.”

Ch. Malster explained that under the current Zoning Bylaw, no boundary fence can exceed six (6) feet in height unless a variance is granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals. The proposed article would allow a boundary fence (or a fence in combination with a wall) up to eight (8) feet in height to be allowed by special permit. The definition of “structure” would also be amended to specify that where a fence is installed on top of a wall, the combined height of the wall and the fence together would be considered in determining compliance with the height requirement.

Mr. Olanoff stated that he does not completely support this proposed amendment as he does not want to encourage high fences by right. Other Board members expressed their preference for a special permit to construct a fence meeting the criteria of the bylaw, rather than requiring applicants to apply to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) for dimensional variances. Mr. Malster noted that the proposed article would limit the height of a retaining wall with a fence to a maximum combined height of 8’.

Resident, Paul Kelly of Willard Circle asked if the ZBA would remain the Special Permit Granting Authority (SPGA) for such fences. Mr. Malster said that it would.

Mr. Jaillet commented that the definition of structure set forth in the Zoning Bylaw references a 6’ fence, while the expanded bylaw refers to an 8’ fence. Mr. Malster replied that the clarification provided by the proposed article is necessary to address those situations where a fence is constructed on top of a retaining wall.

Article 2:

To see if the Town will vote 1) to amend Section 2 [DEFINITIONS] by inserting the following definition and redesignating others to maintain appropriate alphabetical order or take any action in relation thereto:

“Commercial Vehicle Any motor vehicle on which is affixed any writing or logo to designate the business or professional affiliation of said

vehicle, or any vehicle with ladders, tools, stock or supplies visibly stored on the exterior of the vehicle."

2) to amend Section 4.3.3.1 [ACCESSORY USES IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS] to delete the parentheses and insert the words "with a gross vehicle weight of less than 26,000 pounds" at the end of the sentence so that Section 4.3.3.1 reads as follows, or take any other action in relation thereto:

"4.3.3.1 Private garage for not more than three (3) passenger motor vehicles including not more than one (1) commercial vehicle with a gross vehicle weight of less than 26,000 pounds.";

3) to amend Section 4.3.3.2 [ACCESSORY USES IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS] to insert "Private garage or the parking or storage area for" in place of the words "The garaging or maintaining of" and to insert the words "with a gross vehicle weight of less than 26,000 pounds" after the word "vehicle" so that Section 4.3.3.2 reads as follows, or take any other action in relation thereto:

"4.3.3.2 Private garage and/or the parking or storage area of more than three (3) passenger motor vehicles, or of more than one (1) commercial vehicle with a gross vehicle weight of less than 26,000 pounds, but only where in connection with a Principal Use on the same premises."

Ch. Malster explained that, currently, the Zoning Bylaw allows for one commercial vehicle by right in residential districts, and permits more than one commercial vehicle by special permit in residential districts, with no size restrictions. In addition, any commercial vehicle in excess of 8,500 pounds and 20 feet in length that is parked overnight in a residential district must be screened so that it can not be seen at normal eye level from any abutting lot in a residential district. The proposed article would provide for a definition of "commercial vehicle", and would restrict the size of commercial vehicles allowed in residential districts (both as of right and by special permit) to a gross vehicle weight of 26,000 pounds or less. This would prohibit Class 7 and Class 8 vehicles with a gross vehicle weight of more than 26,000 pounds from being parked or stored in residential districts (i.e. tractor trailers 40 feet or more in length, moving trucks, dump trucks, concrete trucks) regardless of screening.

There was discussion questioning the necessity of the word "passenger". It was determined that the section was intended to restrict the gross weight of allowed vehicles to less than 26,000 lbs.

A question was raised as to whether the overnight parking of a commercial vehicle during the course of a residential construction project would be prohibited under the proposed article. Attorney Orsmond stated that such parking would not be in violation, because it would not be interpreted as the "garaging" of that construction vehicle.

Mrs. Elaine DeReyna of 221 Hartford Street asked whether a neighbor would be in violation due to the fact that he has more than one vehicle with commercial plates on his property. The Board responded that the garaging of more than three such vehicles would amount to a violation.

The Board discussed changes to the wording of proposed Article 2 to improve its clarity. The following new wording was approved for recommendation to the Finance Commission:

Revised Article 2:

To see if the Town will vote 1) to amend Section 2 [DEFINITIONS] by inserting the

following definition and redesignating others to maintain appropriate alphabetical order or take any action in relation thereto:

“Commercial Vehicle Any motor vehicle bearing commercial plates, or on which is affixed any writing or logo to designate the business or professional affiliation of said vehicle, or any vehicle with ladders, tools, stock or supplies visibly stored on the exterior of the vehicle.” ;

2) to amend Section 4.3.3.1 [ACCESSORY USES IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS] to delete the word “passenger” and to delete the parentheses and insert the words “with a gross vehicle weight of less than 26,000 pounds” at the end of the sentence so that Section 4.3.3.1 reads as follows, or take any other action in relation thereto:

“4.3.3.1 Private garage for not more than three (3) motor vehicles including not more than one (1) commercial vehicle with a gross vehicle weight of less than 26,000 pounds.”;

3) to amend Section 4.3.3.2 [ACCESSORY USES IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS] to insert “Private garage or the parking or storage area for” in place of the words “The garaging or maintaining of”, to delete the word “passenger”, and to insert the words “with a gross vehicle weight of less than 26,000 pounds” after the word “vehicle” so that Section 4.3.3.2 reads as follows, or take any other action in relation thereto:

“4.3.3.2 Private garage and/or the parking or storage area of more than three (3) motor vehicles, or of more than one (1) commercial vehicle with a gross vehicle weight of less than 26,000 pounds, but only where in connection with a Principal Use on the same premises.”

Article 3:

To see if the Town will vote to amend Section 2 [DEFINITIONS] 1) to delete the definition of “Fast Order Food” in its entirety; and 2) to delete the definition of “Fast Order Food Establishment” in its entirety and to insert a new definition that reads as follows and redesignating others to maintain appropriate alphabetical order or take any action in relation thereto:

“Fast Order Food Establishment An establishment whose primary business is the sale of food or beverages for consumption on or off the premises which is (1) primarily intended for immediate consumption rather than for use as an ingredient or component of meals; (2) available upon a short waiting time; and (3) packaged or presented in such a manner that it can be readily eaten outside the premises where it is sold. For purposes of this Bylaw, the following shall be considered to be Fast Order Food Establishments: (a) establishments which do not provide direct table service to their patrons; (b) establishments providing primarily take-out service or delivery service; and (c) establishments where the patrons order at a counter or window and carry the food order to a table.”

Chairman Malster stated that the Building Commissioner had requested a more specific definition of a fast food establishment, to clarify the Town's desires, particularly in regard to the categories of ice cream and coffee shops. He added that there is a lack of support for

this article by the Economic Development Advisory Board, Board of Selectmen and Finance Commission. Mr. McKeown and Mr. Jaillet commented that the proposed definition needs work to prevent unintended consequences. A commitment was made to establish a committee of town board members and residents to work on an amendment to this section of the Zoning Bylaw for presentation at the 2009 Town Meeting. Therefore, this article will be withdrawn.

Article 4:

To see if the Town will vote to amend Section 7.1.1 [EARTH MATERIAL MOVEMENT] so that it reads as follows, or take any other action in relation thereto:

"7.1.1 Special Permit Required. No soil, loam, sand, gravel, topsoil, borrow, rock, sod peat, humus, clay, stone or other earth material shall be exported, imported and/or regraded on any premises within the Town unless such export, import and/or regrading will constitute an exempt operation as hereinafter provided or is done pursuant to a special permit therefor granted by the Board of Appeals. The Planning Board shall be the Special Permit Granting Authority for the export, import and/or regrading of earth material on any parcel of land in connection with 1) the construction of streets and the installation of municipal services as shown on a subdivision plan; or 2) a plan submitted pursuant to Section 7.2, Major Business Development (MBD), Section 7.3, Environmental Impact and Design Review, Section 8.5, Major Residential Development (MRD), Section 8.6, Senior Residential Development (SRD) or Section 9.5, Planned Development Area Overlay District (PDAOD)."

Ch. Malster explained that the proposed article would designate the Planning Board as the Special Permit Granting Authority for the Earth Material Movement special permit for commercial projects which also require special permits from the Planning Board for Section 7.2 Major Business Development, Section 7.3 Environmental Impact and Design Review, and Section 9.5 Planned Development Area Overlay District. This would allow required hearings to be held simultaneously, and would result in site development and site disturbance issues being dealt with by a single board.

Ch. Malster stated that this article would make the Planning Board the SPGA for the Earth Material Movement Special Permitting process in those cases where a proposed project was before the Planning Board for another approval, such as in the case of a subdivision or site plan review.

Article 5:

To see if the Town will vote to amend Section 8.6 [SENIOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT] to insert a new Section 8.6.2.6 that reads as follows, or take any other action in relation thereto:

"8.6.3.6 The minimum lot area shall be five (5) acres."

Ch. Malster explained that state regulations for proposed Senior Residential Developments were recently amended to remove a 5-acre minimum lot size requirement. Section 8.6 of the Zoning Bylaw does not currently specify a minimum lot size for such developments. This section was originally developed with the understanding that all proposals would be

required to meet the both the local bylaw and the state regulations. In order to maintain the original context of section 8.6, the Planning Board proposed amending section 8.6 to include a minimum 5-acre requirement.

Ch. Malster stated that the minimum lot area for Senior Residential Development (SRD) applications pursuant to the proposed article would be five acres, mirroring the state's previous minimum requirement. Mr. Moore stated that the proposed article was unintended to avoid unintended consequences due to the elimination of the minimum size requirement from state law. Mr. Olanoff expressed concerns about the proposed article. He expressed the opinion that the Planning Board should study whether or 5 acres would be the appropriate lot size in this town. He noted that such study could determine that either a higher or lower minimum acreage would be better. Mr. Olanoff suggested that the Planning Board withdraw this proposed article for further study. Mr. Montgomery stated that he would like more information on why the state law had been amended to remove the minimum project size.

Mr. Ed Musto voiced concerns about the addition of a minimum lot size to the Zoning Bylaw. He stated that he did not believe the size of a proposed project was as critical as other factors in its design and location. He stated that the proposed article would impede senior residential development. Mr. Moore responded that developing fundamental criteria for the minimum lot area are very important. He noted that the state's elimination of its minimum acreage requirement could open up areas in town where unintended consequences may occur. Mr. Olanoff stated that the Planning Board would lose some flexibility in its review of suitable projects if the proposed five acre minimum lot size is imposed.

Ch. Malster pointed out that the Board appeared to be divided 2 to 2 on the proposed article. He said there would be further discussion on this article at the continuation of the hearing on March 19th. Ch. Malster said that he would contact absent board member, Henry Gale, to get his opinion on the proposed article.

Article 6:

To see if the Town will vote to amend Section 4.5.8 [RECONSTRUCTION AFTER CATASTROPHE OR VOLUNTARY DEMOLITION] so that it reads as follows, or take any other action in relation thereto:

"4.5.8 Single and Two-Family Reconstruction after Catastrophe or Voluntary Demolition. Any single and two-family nonconforming structure may be reconstructed after a catastrophe or after voluntary demolition in accordance with the following provisions:

4.5.8.1 Reconstruction of said premises shall commence within one (1) year after such catastrophe or demolition.

4.5.8.2 The building as reconstructed shall meet one or more of the following provisions:

4.5.8.2.1 building as reconstructed which is located on the same footprint as the original structure, and which is only as great in volume or area as the original nonconforming structure; or;

4.5.8.2.2 building as reconstructed which complies with all current setback, yard and building coverage

requirements and has a maximum building height of twenty-five (25) feet regardless of whether the lot complies with current lot area and lot frontage requirements.

- 4.5.8.3 In the event that the proposed reconstruction does not meet the provisions of Sections 4.5.8.1 and 4.5.8.2, a special permit shall be required from the Board of Appeals for such demolition and reconstruction."**

Ch. Malster explained that, currently, the Zoning Bylaw permits additions to non-conforming one and two family structures. However, in the case where an applicant chooses to demolish a non-conforming structure and reconstruct it to match exactly the existing structure with a new addition, a special permit is required from the Board of Appeals. The proposed amendment would allow for more flexibility in the voluntary demolition and reconstruction of non-conforming one and two family residential structures, where the stated conditions are met.

Ch. Malster stated that the Building Commissioner requested this article to streamline this section of the bylaw addressing voluntary demolition and reconstruction after a catastrophe.

Mr. Moore stated that the language of the proposed article was somewhat confusing. He suggested that the article be reworded to read as follows:

Revised Article 6:

To see if the Town will vote to amend Section 4.5.8 [RECONSTRUCTION AFTER CATASTROPHE OR VOLUNTARY DEMOLITION] so that it reads as follows, or take any other action in relation thereto:

"4.5.8 Single and Two-Family Reconstruction after Catastrophe or Voluntary Demolition. Any single and two-family nonconforming structure may be reconstructed after a catastrophe or after voluntary demolition in accordance with the following provisions:

- 4.5.8.1 Reconstruction of said premises shall commence within one (1) year after such catastrophe or demolition.**

- 4.5.8.2 The building as reconstructed shall:**

- 4.5.8.2.1 be located on the same footprint as the original structure, and shall only be as great in volume or area as the original nonconforming structure; or;**

- 4.5.8.2.2 comply with all current setback, yard and building coverage requirements and shall have a maximum building height of twenty-five (25) feet regardless of whether the lot complies with current lot area and lot frontage requirements.**

- 4.5.8.3 In the event that the proposed reconstruction does not meet the provisions of Sections 4.5.8.1 and 4.5.8.2, a special permit shall be required from the Board of Appeals for such demolition and reconstruction."**

Mr. Olanoff stated that he did not want to prioritize or encourage tear downs for new construction over renovations of existing structures. He requested more time to consider any unintended consequences of this article. Ch. Malster said that this article would be held over for further consideration at the next meeting.

Article 7:

To see if the Town will vote to amend Section 9.4.7.5 [WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS OVERLAY DISTRICT] to insert the words "on a Major Wireless Communications facility" after the first recitation of the word "antennae" so that Section 9.4.7.5 reads as follows, or take any action in relation thereto:

"9.4.7.5 All antennae on a Major wireless communications facility shall be single unit cross-polar antennae."

Ch. Malster explained that the proposed article would clarify that the Wireless Communications Overlay District requirement for cross-polar antennas refers only to those located on monopoles. Most antennas that are located on existing structures, by virtue of current technology, can not be cross-polar.

Ch. Malster stated that this amendment provides for an insertion of the words "on a major wireless communications facility". This directly relates to current technology terminology.

Mr. Moore suggested that the proposed article be reworded to also change the word "antennae" to "antennas" throughout this section of the Zoning Bylaw.

Revised Article 7:

To see if the Town will vote to amend Section 9.4.7.5 [WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS OVERLAY DISTRICT] to insert the words "on a Major Wireless Communications facility" after the first recitation of the word "antennae", and replace the word "antennae" where it appears in this section with the word "antennas", so that Section 9.4.7.5 reads as follows, or take any action in relation thereto:

"9.4.7.5 All antennas on a Major wireless communications facility shall be single unit cross-polar antennas."

Article 8:

To see if the Town will vote to amend Section 9.6.9 [MUOD CONDITIONS] to insert a new Section 9.6.9.5 that reads as follows, or take any action in relation thereto:

"9.6.9.5 Signs. Notwithstanding the requirements of Section 6.2 of this Bylaw, the Planning Board may through the Environmental Impact and Design Review process under Section 7.3 of this Bylaw approve the erection and maintenance of such signs that (a) are located within the boundaries of, or relate to, a project for which an MUOD Area Master Plan special permit has been issued under Section 9.6.4 of this Bylaw, and (b) comply with signage guidelines approved by the Planning Board in connection with the issuance of such Area Master Plan special permit and with the conditions of any consolidated special permit issued as part of such Area

Master Plan special permit pursuant to Sections 9.6.4 and 6.2.17 of this Bylaw. The provisions of Section 6.2 of this Bylaw shall apply to signs erected and maintained other than in accordance with an Area Master Plan special permit that establishes signage guidelines."

Ch. Malster said that the proposed article would permit the Planning Board's consideration and approval of on-site and off-site signs related to proposed developments within the Mixed Use Overlay District as part of the Environmental Impact Design Review for such developments.

Ch. Malster noted that the proposed article would eliminate the need for a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Article 9:

To see if the Town will vote 1) to amend Section 4.3.3.7 [ACCESSORY USES IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS] to insert the word "vehicle" after the word "passenger" so that it reads as follows, or take any other action in relation thereto:

"4.3.3.7 Parking or storage area, for use by the occupant of the dwelling, for the purpose of parking or storing in the rear of the yard and not substantially visible from the street one of the following: one (1) unoccupied recreational vehicle of less than thirty (30) feet length; one (1) inoperative passenger vehicle which has not been partially or wholly dismantled.";

2) to amend Section 4.3.3.8 [ACCESSORY USES IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS] to delete the words "one of the following:" so that it reads as follows, or take any other action in relation thereto:

"4.3.3.8 Parking or storage area, for use by the occupant of the dwelling, for the purpose of parking or storing in the rear of the yard and not substantially visible from the street one (1) unoccupied recreational vehicle of thirty (30) feet length or more.";

3) to amend Section 4.4.3.3 [ACCESSORY APARTMENTS] to delete the word "habitable" in the first sentence so that it reads as follows, or take any other action in relation thereto:

"4.4.3.3 The accessory apartment shall contain not less than five hundred (500) square feet of floor area, and the floor area of the accessory apartment shall not exceed either thirty-three (33%) of the floor area of the combined dwelling or dwellings if the footprint of the principal dwelling is not changed or twenty-four percent (24%) in other cases. In no case shall the accessory apartment exceed nine hundred (900) square feet."

4) To amend Section 2.60 [DEFINITION OF HEIGHT, BUILDING], Section 5.4.2 [HEIGHT DETERMINATION AND EXCEPTIONS] and Section 9.4 [WIRELESS COMMUNICATION OVERLAY DISTRICT] to replace the word "antennae" with the word "antennas".

Ch. Malster explained that the proposed article would clarify certain sections of the Zoning Bylaw, and correct minor errors in the drafting of those sections.

Article 10:

To see if the Town will vote to amend Section 9.6.5.6 [MUOD PERMITTED USES] to delete the word "interior" and to rephrase the section so that so that Section 9.6.5.6 reads as follows, or take any other action in relation thereto:

"9.6.5.6 In MUOD 2 and MUOD 3 only, fast order food establishments;"

Ch. Malster explained that the proposed article would eliminate the requirement that fast food establishments within the MUOD 2 and MUOD 3 districts be limited to interior establishments. This would permit the operation of fast food establishments as individual street front entities within those districts.

Mr. Moore noted that the wording of the proposed article assumed adoption of the proposed definition of "fast order food establishment". He suggested that the wording of the article be changed to read as follows:

Revised Article 10:

To see if the Town will vote to amend Section 9.6.5.6 [MUOD PERMITTED USES] to delete the word "interior" so that so that Section 9.6.5.6 reads as follows, or take any other action in relation thereto:

"9.6.5.6 In MUOD 2 and MUOD 3 only, establishments selling fast order food;"

Article 11:

To see if the Town will vote to amend Section 9.6.8.4.1 [MUOD RESIDENTIAL CONTROLS] to insert the following after the word "Bylaw": ", unless the Planning Board determines a proposed alternative to be at least equivalent in serving the Town's housing needs" so that Section 9.6.8.4.1 reads as follows, or take any other action in relation thereto:

"9.6.8.4.1 A minimum of twelve percent (12%) of the housing units in the Area Master Plan shall be "affordable" as defined in this Bylaw, unless the Planning Board determines a proposed alternative to be at least equivalent in serving the Town's housing needs."

OR

To see if the Town will vote to amend Section 2 [DEFINITIONS] to amend the definition of "Affordable Housing" to insert the following after the word "Program": "and dwelling units in a MUOD eligible for inclusion in the Subsidized Housing Inventory pursuant to M.G.L. Chapter 40B" so that it reads as follows and redesignating others to maintain appropriate alphabetical order or take any action in relation thereto:

"Affordable Housing Dwelling units available at a cost of no more than thirty (30) percent of gross household income to households at or below eighty (80) percent of the Boston PMSA median income as most recently reported by the U.S. Housing and Urban Development (HUD), including units listed under M.G.L Chapter 40B and the State's Local Initiative Program and dwelling units in a MUOD eligible for inclusion in the Subsidized Housing Inventory pursuant to M.G.L. Chapter 40B."

Ch. Malster said that this article would be held for discussion at the next Planning Board meeting.

Article 12:

To see if the Town will vote to amend the Zoning Map of the Town of Westwood by adding four parcels to the existing Local Business B district located on Washington Street. The parcels to be added are Assessors' Map 23, Lots 156, 161 and 165, currently zoned as Single Residence A, and Assessors' Map 23, Lot 163.

The Petitioner did not appear before the Planning Board to present the proposed amendments to the Zoning Map.

On a motion by Mr. Moore and seconded by Mr. Montgomery, the Planning Board voted unanimously to support proposed Articles 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 9 and 10, with amendments noted above, and to oppose proposed Article 12.

Ch. Malster noted that proposed Article 3 was withdrawn and proposed articles 5, 6 and 11 would be held over for further consideration.

On a motion by Mr. Moore and seconded by Mr. Olanoff, the Planning Board voted to continue this public hearing to March 19, 2008, beginning at 7:30 p.m. in the Thurston Middle School Cafeteria.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.