



TOWN CLERK
2022 FEB 11 AM 8:41
DUXBURY, MASS.

TOWN OF DUXBURY



BOARD OF APPEALS

**DUXBURY BOARD OF APPEALS
MEETING MINUTES**

January 13, 2022 @ 7:30 p.m.

ATTENDANCE: Wayne Dennison, Judith Barrett, Kathleen Muncey, Freeman Boynton Jr., Philip Thorn, Borys Gojnycz and Tanya Trevisan

Other persons present at the hearing: James Wasielewski, Building Commissioner, and Lauren Haché, Administrative Assistant

CALL TO ORDER: Wayne Dennison called the meeting to order and reads the Governor's Preamble: Pursuant to Governor Baker's Chapter 20 of the Acts of 2021 dated June 16, 2021, An Act of Extending Certain COVID-19 Measures Adopted During the State of Emergency regarding suspending certain provisions of the Open Meeting Law, , G.L. c. 30A, §18, the Town of Duxbury's Board and/or Committee meetings will be conducted via remote participation to the greatest extent possible with members. For this meeting, members of the public who wish to watch the meeting may do so by viewing the Duxbury Government Access Channels – **Verizon 39 or Comcast 15**. Viewers can visit www.pactv.org/duxbury for information about Duxbury programming including streaming on Duxbury You Tube, to watch replays and Video on Demand.

ZBA Case #2021-06, Harlow Brook LLC, 766, 782 & 0 Temple Street (CONT'D): *The Board voted unanimously (5-0) to continue the public hearing to February 24, 2022 at 7:30 p.m.*

ZBA Case #2021-15, McKeag, 39 Shipyard Lane (CONT'D): *The Board voted unanimously (5-0) to continue the public hearing to January 27, 2022 at 7:30 p.m.*

ZBA Case #2021-28, Husk, 160 Marshall Street (CONT'D): *The Board voted unanimously (5-0) to continue the public hearing to March 24, 2022 at 7:30 p.m.*

Administrative:

Wayne Dennison makes a motion to approve the meeting minutes from October 14, 2021. Judith Barrett seconds.

Wayne Dennison makes a motion to approve the meeting minutes from November 18, 2021. Judith Barrett seconds.

Wayne Dennison makes a motion to adjourn. Emmett Sheehan seconds (5-0)

BOARD OF APPEALS MINUTES

Case No: 2021-15

Petitioner: Charles and Jennifer McKeag

Address: 39 Shipyard Lane

Date: January 13, 2022 Time: 7:30 p.m.

(Continued from December 9, 2021, December 2, 2021, October 28, 2021, September 9, 2021, July 29, 2021, July 8, 2021 and May 27, 2021)

Members present: Wayne Dennison, Judith Barrett, Kathleen Muncey, Philip Thorn, Borys Gojnycz & Tanya Trevisan

Members Voting: Wayne Dennison, Judith Barrett, Kathleen Muncey, Philip Thorn & Borys Gojnycz

Other persons present at the hearing: James Wasielewski, Director of Municipal Services & Lauren Haché, Administrative Assistant

- Wayne Dennison states that there is a full agenda this evening and asks if the representative for this is present. Mr. Dennison also notes that due to weather, the previously scheduled site visit for this case on December 7, 2021 was cancelled. Mr. Dennison asks Lauren Haché when the next reasonable date would be to schedule this case
- Laure Haché suggest January 27th and offers up next week for a site visit
- Wayne Dennison agrees
- Jessica Williams states that works fine
- Wayne Dennison moves to continue the case to Thursday January 27, 2022 at 7:30pm
- Judith Barrett Seconds
- All in favor WD, KM, JB, PT, BG
- Jessica Williams asks to schedule the site visit
- Wayne Dennison agrees and the Board agrees on a site visit Friday, January 21, 2022 at 9:00am

Motion: It was moved, seconded and unanimously voted to continue the public hearing to Thursday, January 27, 2022.

Moved by: WD

Number in favor: 5

Seconded by: JB

Number opposed: 0

BOARD OF APPEALS MINUTES

Case No: 2021-06

Petitioner: Harlow Brook LLC

Address: 766, 782 and 0 Temple Street

Date: January 13, 2022 Time: 7:30 p.m.

(Continued from December 2, 2021, October 28, 2021, September 23, 2021, June 24, 2021, June 10, 2021, May 13, 2021 and March 11, 2021)

Members present: Judith Barrett (CPT), Wayne Dennison, Kathleen Muncey, Freeman Boynton Jr., Emmett Sheehan, Philip Thorn, Borys Gojnycz & Tanya Trevisan

Members Voting: Wayne Dennison, Judith Barrett, Kathleen Muncey, Emmett Sheehan, Freeman Boynton Jr., Philip Thorn & Borys Gojnycz

Other persons present at the hearing: James Wasielewski, Director of Municipal Services & Lauren Haché, Administrative Assistant

- Judith Barrett, Chair Pro Tem, re-opens the public hearing states that the Town's Peer Review Architect, Cliff Boehmer with Davis Square Architects. Ms. Barrett also states that the Town's Civil Engineer Peer Reviewer, Pat Brennan with Amory Engineers is also here this evening. Before we get started, we did receive a few pieces of correspondence that I am going to read into the record. A letter from the Town Committee that is working with the Isaac Simmons Farm across the street and essentially they are asking that the Board, should we approve the project, limit the units to duplexes, which would be more consistent with the neighborhood architecture. We also have a report from the Peer Review Architect, which he will read. Ms. Barrett asks the Agent for the Applicant, Attorney Galvin, if he would like to add anything before the Peer Review Architect starts his presentation.
- Robert Galvin states that their Architect, Eric Tolley cannot participate this evening, he is ill with COVID. Mr. Galvin states we also did some soil testing with Mr. Casey and Mr. Brennan was present to witness. Mr. Galvin continues and recommends a working group with the Board and Applicants to come to a more unified common ground and to narrow the gap on certain issues.
- Judith Barrett states alright, lets have Cliff Boehmer begin
- Cliff Boehmer introduces himself and continues with his findings. Mr. Boehmer states he submit a report back in October and then a follow up November. There is some missing documentation, the development falls outside what the existing pattern of development is nearby. This is not a bad thing, we know that 40B developments are going to be denser, so the idea of this development does not have to match, but there needs to be evidence presented that there have been significant mitigation studies have been deployed. There is inadequate documentation for the type of development we are looking at. The site plans and

landscape plan, but there are no three-dimensional plans and there are no site-specific plans. There are contours on the site this is not flat. The project is not really represented in a meaningful manner. It is not clear if there are basements in these buildings. The building elevations do not show or indicate a basement. There are some fundamental issues about the level of drawings that we have, they are very schematic and successfully communicate the idea, but I think it is very hard to get much beyond that. The larger four and three unit buildings lack articulation in the footprints and whether there is slope etc. This is very two-dimensional and on the east side of the development there are the long four and three unit buildings, we need to know what those look like from the neighbors. The neighbor to the east has a backyard completely open to this development. There is huge dependence on existing materials for landscape, so it is difficult to tell if there is any sufficient screening. On the North side of the site where the project interfaces with the street; there is an indication on the landscape plan that there is intent to preserve some existing landscaping. I would suggest that the Board request that those materials be flagged so that we can get a descent sense on whether the plan is sufficient. In addition, children may inhabit a 40-unit development with 84 total bedrooms that leaves 44 bedrooms that, we do not see on the site plan. We would need a better picture of what it will be like to live in this community and what will be made open space for Residents. This is a development exempt from any accessibility requirements but does include three and four unit buildings that are not exempt. For sale, units are not exempt from group one requirements. I would expect the designer to make a case in how these buildings work. It is the job of the Architect to really make a case that all units meet all State applicable codes. Site circulation should be addressed; the 4-foot wide walkway is minimal. On the East side of the site, the walkway is interrupted. Are there ramps and curb cuts? This is a tightly knit community being proposed, I do not have enough information to dive in deeper. Do I think the unit count is right, I think they certainly could not be any denser; The West side of the site works better than the East side.

- Judith Barrett states thank you that is very helpful. Do you have any thoughts on what this project going to look like, you cannot see the change on the site that will occur because of the grading? How do we explain to people how much change is going to take place on this site
- Cliff Boehmer states you would create individualized elevations. The most effective tools are street level perspectives; bird's eye views etc., the technology is there.
- Judith Barrett states does anyone on the aboard have questions for Mr. Boehmer.
- Wayne Dennison states you indicated that you thought that you could not reasonably pack more units into this space, did I get that right
- Cliff Boehmer states maybe, given what we know about the intent of individual, multi story units, no, it is hard to imagine how you could fit more than this

- Wayne Dennison states thank you
- Kathleen Muncey states we received a letter from a Town group that manages the Town property across the street that suggests all duplexes. DO you have any comment on that?
- Cliff Boehmer states I think the previous design had all duplexes and the problem with duplex homes spread out over the site is that you end up with less usable, outdoor space. They take up more space
- Philip Thorn states did I understand correctly, since some of these buildings will be three and four unit duplexes that accessibility laws will not apply. ADA compliant issues
- Cliff Boehmer states yes, it is beyond accessibility. The two unit building and three and above units are subject to entirely different state codes. From three units on, it is multi-family buildings and there are different codes and subject to all of the applicable parts of the Architectural Access Board. Given the closeness of this development, I would suggest even the buildings that are not required the fire sprinkler code also incorporate that as well. That is my opinion, but the entire community should be protected even though the entire development may not require it by code.
- Jim Wasielewski states I am the Building Commissioner, I would like to ask for further clarification. So, some of the units require sprinkler systems, has anyone done hydraulic calculations or flow tests to see if water is even available on that street
- Philip Thorn states can I just finish my question to clarify, Mr. Boehmer, even the single-family units they may require grade entrance?
- Cliff Boehmer states that the group two units are exempt and are fully accessible units and 5% of the units will have to meet those requirements. Home ownership units are exempt from group two. Group One units are not exempt from this, with multi level units Boards have to understand what town home units are and home ownership units. Do these need accessible at grade entry? It is a current issue
- Philip Thorn states thank you
- Wayne Dennison states can I jump in, so we are asked in the context of these 40B developments to waive requirements and many of those or Town requirements. Are those waivable under 40B?
- Cliff Boehmer states no, you do not have the authority to waive state law
- Judith Barrett agrees
- Jim Wasielewski states it doesn't make sense to run all of those hydraulics at this point until the project is approved, so you don't have to respond to that, thank you
- Judith Barrett states I think the issue that is raised by Wayne's comment is if these are things that cannot be waived, do we have building designs that reflect what has to be built with the code. We just don't have sufficient information

- Pat Brennan with Amory Engineers, to answer Mr. Wasielewski's question, I have been in contact with the Applicants and they did state they have been working with the Water Dept. but I have not yet seen anything, but they did state they would get in touch with the department. I was out there yesterday witnessing test pits and one of my biggest concerns is whether the site drainage design will work. I would like a test pit at every infiltration system and they do have that now at each one. The only other comment I have is that I did look at the architecture plans in terms of the site plans and there are discrepancies and I did forward that to Mr. Casey as well. I will make sure the discrepancies are cleared up on the next set of plans.
- Judith Barrett states great, thank you
- Robert Galvin states thank you, I represent the Applicant Mounir Tayara. I know Mr. Boehmer very well from other projects in years past and we always appreciate his comments. He is extremely articulate and thoughtful. We do have some fundamental disagreements. Mr. Galvin shares his screen and explains some of the plans. There are five two-unit buildings on the site being proposed. All of the units will have a basement. Mr. Galvin shares a quad rendering for the Board and audience to view. Mr. Galvin shows other options of units that they are willing to share and discuss with the Board. We broke these buildings up after the initial comments and this mimics other projects that have been permitted in the past in town. All we are obligated to do is submit preliminary concept plans at this stage. Mr. Galvin shares a landscape plan and explains it is robust and there is green space and it is screened from the view of many, even from the highway
- Judith Barrett states I will open up the hearing for public comment, specifically for the Architect peer Review Consultant, since he is here tonight and will not be with us every meeting.
- Robert and Laura Melton, 732 Temple Street states one, we have concern over the fill amount that is going to be trucked in and second the estimates of the number of trucks coming and going during this project of 2,500-4,000 loads of material. Could you address that and second, in your opinion on what would be an appropriate number of units for this location, if 40 is as dense as can be
- Cliff Boehmer states so I did a broad range estimate for the dump truck trips because it was not clear to me from the documents on whether or not there will be basements and that is a big deal. If basements are dug, then that fill can be used to fill. The reason I made that statement was to encourage the Board to perhaps request some level of construction management plan to describe how the project will happen and how it is achievable. I really do not know what the appropriate number of units for this project I am not convinced that there is enough information available. We have no indication of how tall those buildings are at this point, especially in terms of the grade. That is fundamental information.

- Adam Schwebach and Kira Sullivan, 756 Temple Street, we are the direct Eastern Abutter. I thought it would be helpful if Cliff, you could mention or recommend screening.
- Cliff Boehmer states I think that the entire site will be a massive clearing of this and I cannot tell how much of that is conifer etc.
- Adam Schewach states there is a natural stall that runs down Temple Street and on my side of the rock wall is my side and the other side is the development so there is no real screening. I am highly concerned about this and I do not want to have to be reserve in my land and have them relying on my piece of property to provide screening for their development. I don't want to reserve my trees to provide screening
- Alia Salam-Selamah, 16 Laurel Street, what would fit in with the existing architecture here
- Cliff Boehmer states the Developer should ask that and ask how to match the feel in the neighborhood and then screening comes into play. That's why I requested flagging materials
- Alia Salam-Selamah states how is the existing vegetation on the landscape plan help screen the quadplexes that are at the beginning of the complex only feet from Temple Street. Attorney Galvin said nothing would be visible from the street and I don't understand how
- Cliff Boehmer states a more robust plan of the proposed landscape materials should be able to achieve this
- Alia Salam-Selamah states is the school bus hut visible from Temple Street
- Cliff Boehmer states that is not clear, but I think it's a school bus waiting area
- Alia Salam-Selamah states what about street lighting
- Cliff Boehmer states there is site lighting proposed but no drawing submitted to demonstrate this
- Alia Salam-Selamah states when the walk through being re-scheduled for is.
- Judith Barrett states ok, we need to talk this back to the Board. Does the Board have a preference on a site visit, maybe next week
- Wayne Dennison and Judith Barrett are available, Freeman Boynton Jr. and Emmett Sheehan can also and Philip Thorn
- Freeman Boynton Jr. asks if the site is staked
- Borys Gojnycz states I cannot attend but can visit the site. I also would like to know what the noise level will e from route 3
- Judith Barrett states when can we continue this
- Robert Galvin states we can meet again next month
- Judith Barrett states February 10th
- Lauren Haché states we have three new cases on that evening
- Judith Barrett states February 24th
- Robert Galvin states that is fine and renews his request about a working group
- Judith Barrett agrees and moves to continue for February 24, 2022
- Emmett Sheehan seconds

- All in favor JB, WD, ES, FB, KM
- Judith Barrett states Attorney Galvin could you provide an extension to this
- Attorney Galvin agrees to extend through mid-March

Motion: It was moved, seconded and unanimously voted to continue the public hearing to Thursday, February 24, 2022.

Moved by: JB

Seconded by: ES

Number in favor: 5

Number opposed: 0

BOARD OF APPEALS MINUTES

Case No: 2021-28

Petitioner: Husk, Eagles Nest B&B

Address: 160 Marshall Street

Date: January 13, 2022 Time: 7:30 p.m.

(Continued from October 28, 2021)

Members present: Wayne Dennison, Judith Barrett, Kathleen Muncey, Freeman Boynton Jr., Emmett Sheehan, Philip Thorn, Borys Gojnycz & Tanya Trevisan

Members Voting: Wayne Dennison, Judith Barrett, Kathleen Muncey, Emmett Sheehan, Freeman Boynton Jr., Philip Thorn & Borys Gojnycz

Other persons present at the hearing: James Wasielewski, Director of Municipal Services & Lauren Haché, Administrative Assistant

- Wayne Dennison re-opens the public hearing, reads the public hearing notice, and states we have received an extraordinary amount of materials including the application and site plan; we received case response from the Board of Health, the Conservation Commission, the Planning Board and the Design Review Board. Mr. Dennison has Lauren Haché the Admin. Read the materials that were submit from Abutters in opposition, around 22 if I am counting correctly and then reads about roughly 128 letters in support that was submit that day.
- Lauren Haché reads the over 128 letters in support being businesses and Residents.
- Attorney Christopher Davidson states we have 38 letters in opposition and 160 in support. Mr. Davidson, the Applicants Agent begins the presentation and explains that the location is suitable and appropriate as outlined by the Duxbury Protective Bylaws. The Husks have owned the property for many decades and the property is secluded and set back from all area properties and could be classified as a retreat, as it has been used previously. Attorney Davidson states based on what he has researched within the Town, there is only one current, permitted Bed and Breakfast and many Residents are constantly looking for a place for their visiting family members to stay short term. Attorney Davidson continues that Mrs. Husk is from Brazilian descent and this could show the female business ownership and inclusiveness with diversity. We submitted a traffic study report that confirms in peak congestion, there will only be one additional vehicle. This covered Marshall Street onto the private roadway. We ran three models that confirmed no traffic impact. We have 16 letters in support from local businesses and there is a consensus that this is going to help them. Lastly, I would like to point out that we do have a septic design pending approval we would move forward with that plan with the Board of Health.
- Wayne Dennison states I have a few questions, we got a Conservation Commission Orders of Conditions relative to the Bungalows; Were these bungalows previously rented and where are we at now with this

- Christopher Davidson states that the application and B&B is focused solely on the main home and that the bungalows are not intended for use
- Wayne Dennison states would the Applicant be comfortable or what is the intended use of the bungalows
- Christopher Davidson states perhaps Jim Wasielewski can speak to this as my clients have been working with him to get them in to compliance and we have abandoned the bungalows and we're talking about the house
- Wayne Dennison states alright, you spoke about the traffic study, how will this impact the intersection of Marshall Street and Standish
- Christopher Davidson states it would be one additional vehicle during peak hours
- Wayne Dennison states that is Standish and Marshall
- Christopher Davidson states yes
- Wayne Dennison states and that is the same at Eagle's Nest
- Christopher Davidson states yes
- Wayne Dennison states this property is at the end of a private road, so on that private road there is 152, 166, 156 and 158, are any of those Residents among the people who have supported this project among the letters that we have received.
- Christopher Davidson states I would have to look through all if the submissions; it is my understanding that they have not, but we did have a signature from Mr. Weiss and I understand he has come forward today to retract that statement.
- Wayne Dennison states does the Board have any questions for the Applicant
- Borys Gojnycz states the private road, is there an easement or personal service and maintenance on that road
- Christopher Davidson states yes there is a shared maintenance and states that his clients would consider that if the Neighbors were in agreement
- Kathleen Muncey states the bungalows are they dwelling units and is there any plan to rent those out too and have they been dwelling units in the past
- Christopher Davidson reiterates that the bungalows are not part of the application before them and that the Applicants are working with the Building Inspector for compliance
- Tanya Trevisan states in the materials provided one of the pieces attached is an addendum and it references the original application that was previously submitted. Was the application previously amended
- Christopher Davidson states no, that was previously submitted
- Tanya Trevisan states the Addendum references the bungalows
- Christopher Davidson apologizes and I believe I sent the incorrect addendum, this should just be the four bedrooms in the house
- Wayne Dennison states Jim are you available to speak to the bungalows
- James Wasielewski states well, they originally wanted to have tiny houses, but the Bylaw does not allow trailers on the property, so we worked with them to have compliant accessory structures with a zoning permit
- Wayne Dennison questions the zoning permit

- Jim Wasielewski states a zoning permit for anything under 200 square feet that is an accessory structure, like a shed. They have to finish the inside and they are intending to use them for family and friends and not renting them out.
- Wayne Dennison states that Con Comm. indicated that they move them back
- Jim Wasielewski states they are moved back in agreement with Conservation
- Kathleen Muncey states but they are trailers
- Jim Wasielewski states they are on blocks now with aprons being built around them and they are anchored to the ground. They won't be mobile and they are sitting on blocks, like a shed
- Emmett Sheehan states Jim, you started off saying trailers are not allowed given our Bylaws
- Jim Wasielewski states they are no longer trailers, they are mounted on blocks and will be stationary accessory structure
- Emmett Sheehan states a trailer is still a trailer, just because the wheels are off doesn't make it a trailer
- Jim Wasielewski disagrees and states it is not intended to be used as a trailer
- Wayne Dennison states in the record there are several materials referencing enforcement
- Jim Wasielewski states initially the complaints came in, so we issued stop work orders, so we worked with them through that and got them permitted. Then complaints came in about them renting these out as a B&B and then the Neighbors complained again about illegal rentals. I worked with Town Counsel to construct another letter to remind them they are doing this without a permit and the response was that they had to do this to keep food on the table. I am working with Counsel, as far as I know they are no longer renting the bungalows out after the second cease and desist. They installed a gate and fence, so we cannot get into the property to witness this, but I have been working with Chris Davidson and the Husks and let them know that they need to proceed the proper way.
- Christopher Davidson states Mr. Dennison, could I ask the Board if they are considering the bungalows as part of this B&B application
- Wayne Dennison states I am going to decline to take questions from the Applicant at this time, we are going to do this in the other direction. Would the Applicants consider the bungalows be conditioned to not be allowed in the special permit, should this proceed
- Christopher Davidson agrees
- Wayne Dennison states does the Board have any concern to go a little longer this evening
- Judith Barrett asks for the cutoff time
- Wayne Dennison states 10:15pm, why do not we open this up for public comment. We were contacted by an Attorney Mr. Uitti, he submit a variety of materials and has asked to share the screen

- Attorney David Uitti states Lauren has been fantastic with this process. I represent several neighbors that use this lane, they are William and Jennifer Rice of 152 Marshall Street, The Kunz of 154 Marshall Street and The Irving's of 166 Marshall Street and then some more that are on the record. Mr. Uitti shares his screen of a video of the neighborhood and the area to the driveway to the B&B. Mr. Uitti continues to explain the concern of the Abutters in particular to the traffic. Under section 906.2.1.A, it is not suitable given the inadequacy of the roads. Only one car can fit down the driveway. It is a confusing property and it is easy that a guest would confuse the properties. My Clients have had illegal guests wonder onto their property and the police have been called. My clients have had B&B guests knocking on their door, which is disruptive. This will also create an environmental impact to the land and surrounding bay. In the summer peak season, this would create intensity.
- Wayne Dennison states can I ask a question, shouldn't Con Comm. Look at environmental impacts
- Mr. Uitti states I think the Con Comm. Response was in reference to the bungalows on the property and not the B&B
- Wayne Dennison states alright, thanks
- Mr. Uitti states the traffic report is not correct if there are four rooms, four more cars, the Applicants are required to live there, and so the car amounts will increase significantly. These studies were not done in peak time they were performed in December. The site plan does not show the proposed parking, a requirement of section 906.5A. The Bylaw also requires certain things on a plot plan due to its overlay districts. The ZBA should deny this special permit because the Applicant has repeatedly violated the Bylaw. Briefly, from 2019 through the end of 2021 the Applicants have been illegally renting out six units, the house, the cottage, the garage and large unit and the bungalows. There are reviews that can prove this illegal renting. Mr. Wasielewski on May 4, 2021 the first violation letter was sent out where they were asked to stop. Reviews and renting of the property continued after May 4. Mr. Wasielewski sent a second letter on July 12 again issuing a stop work order and that they are operating an unlawful B&B. They did not stop and continued to rent out six units, which is unlawful especially where the Bylaw only allows four units to be rented and these are unlawful. Mr. Wasielewski then sent a fourth letter on October 19, 2021 certified mail cease and desist for operating an illegal B&B. The reviews online show that they have never stopped the illegal renting. Past practice by these folks is indicative of how they will behave. They have since listed the property for future rental of the cottage on the property starting in August of 2022, shares his screen of the green roof cottage rental for \$600/night despite receiving three cease, and desist letters from Mr. Wasielewski. They also did an unlawful demo and rebuild of a pier, trampling of salt marsh, and finally they put an illegal installation of the building department with the bungalows without permits. They do what they want and then try to fix it after the fact when they are caught. Mr. Uitti states they use profanity and threats to anyone that disagrees with

what they are looking to do and Mr. Uitti reads a letter that Cleonice Husk wrote to Mr. Kunz. My Clients have heard from many in town in opposition but will not submit letters in fear of retaliation. Mr. Uitti states the Board denied a one bedroom B&B for a good family, but the neighbors did not want in their neighborhood, so this is a much greater use in a much denser neighborhood. We respectfully request that the Board deny this application.

- Wayne Dennison states does the Board have any questions for Mr. Uitti
- Borys Gojnycz states thank you for the video, do we have anything from Chief Nord or emergency vehicles heading out that road
- Wayne Dennison states we can request an overall site visit of the Board and get the Fire Chiefs opinion
- Wayne Dennison moves to continue to February 24th
- Judith Barrett states Mr. Chair, we have Harlow Brook continued that night and I want to point that out
- Wayne Dennison asks Lauren Haché for a free date
- Lauren Haché states March 10th
- Christopher Davidson states I cannot, I am unavailable
- Lauren Haché states March 24th
- Christopher Davidson and David Uitti thank everyone
- Wayne Dennison moves to continue the public hearing to March 24, 2022
- Emmett Sheehan seconds
- All in favor WD, JB, KM, FB, ES

Motion: It was moved, seconded and unanimously voted to continue the public hearing to Thursday, March 24, 2022 at 7:30 p.m.

Moved by: WD
Number in favor: 5

Seconded by: ES
Number opposed: 0