

**Planning Board  
Lakeville, Massachusetts  
Minutes of Meeting  
Thursday, May 12, 2022**

On May 12, 2022, the Planning Board held a meeting at the Lakeville Police Station. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Knox at 7:05 p.m. LakeCam was making a video recording of the meeting.

**Members present:**

Mark Knox, Chair; Peter Conroy, Vice-Chair; Michele MacEachern, Jack Lynch, Nora Cline

**Others attending:**

Marc Resnick, Town Planner

**Public Hearing (7:05) – To amend the Zoning By-law Section 6.7 Site Plan Review by deleting the existing section and replacing it with a new Section 6.7 Site Plan Review which would include Sub-sections 6.7.1 Purpose, 6.7.2 Authority, 6.7.3 Applicability, 6.7.4 Submittal Requirements, 6.7.5 Review Procedure, 6.7.6 Performance Standards, 6.7.7 Architectural Requirements, and 6.7.8 Decision, Inspection, Fees and Appeals**

Mr. Knox opened Public Hearing #1 on the agenda and read the summary description into the record. He asked for discussion from the Board in regards to this item. Ms. MacEachern said under 6.7.5 Review Procedure, it looks like Open Space has been taken off of the distribution list. She thought that it would be better for Open Space to remain and continue to review and offer their related feedback. Mr. Resnick said they could put it back in, but it would have to be added in as an amendment.

Ms. MacEachern asked what, if any, impact this amendment would have on the current density bonus. Mr. Resnick said it would have none. They haven't proposed changing lot coverages or density bonuses. There is some overlap. They will be discussing if they want to keep or modify that section if this amendment should pass. They can then see how this works and if they want to amend it, that would be something for the fall Town Meeting.

Mr. Norman Orrall stated he had questions regarding the following:

- 6.7.1.1, he didn't see where sound and dust were listed as they are in the current bylaw. He felt that should be included as items to consider.
- In the strikethrough version, 6.7.2 did not strike out the word industrial and it just says authority. Information required by the applicant #17 currently requires an engineered plan, but that is not on the new list of requirements.
- 6.7.3 applicability, item #3. What does that mean? Mr. Knox said this is an amendment that had been made previously. It was to clarify the concern of existing buildings that

changed tenants. If with that change they increased their occupant load, it was a way to retrigger the Site Plan Review.

- 6.7.3 applicability, item #6. What triggers that or how does that come to the attention of anyone? Should that be clarified in this bylaw? Mr. Knox advised that was changed recently from 3,000 square feet to the acre now in the bylaw. It had been ignored because every septic system replacement, driveway paving, etc. would have required a Site Plan Review. After further discussion, Mr. Knox said that he did not want to defeat what they have and then lose it. He would rather take everything under advisement and put it on as an amendment for the fall Town Meeting.
- 6.7.6.7 screening, buffers...requirements. It appears that they are now asking any applicant under Site Plan Review to provide screening regardless of what it formally said. An industrial applicant now does not have to provide screening if there is a road separating it from residential. Mr. Resnick said there is another section in the zoning bylaw that does require screening between certain residential uses and business uses. He noted that some of the items mentioned such as disposal of wastes, stormwater runoff, circulation, etc. were put into performance standards. He then noted some additional language that could be added into the purpose of the standards.

Mr. Orrall then discussed why engineered plans by a certified architect would not still be required for buildings over 35,000 cubic feet. Mr. Resnick said they do not review building plans for construction, but that should go through the Building Inspector. The Board is looking at the plan for architectural consistency and design. He was unsure if there was a building code requirement for a large building. Mr. Knox said the Board should only require building elevations. They should not be required to review anything within the walls of the building. Mr. Resnick said unless it affects the use of the site then it would be important to have an interior layout of the building. Mr. Knox added they would also be interested in the fire hookup for the Fire Department on the outside of the building or anything related to safety. Mr. Resnick said that usually with a large-scale project they get professionally drawn building plans, which are renderings by an architect, of the buildings, the floor plan, etc.

Mr. Knox said he had for amendments adding the performance standards to include 6.7.1.1 from the previous site plan review bylaw. Mr. Resnick said another amendment was to add the Open Space Committee to the distribution list. Mr. Knox then made a motion, to make an amendment to add Open Space to the review Board list and amend performance standards to include 6.7.1.1 from the previous Site Plan Review Bylaw. He made a motion to recommend approval of the Site Plan Review bylaw with those amendments for the new 6.7 Site Plan Review bylaw. It was seconded by Ms. Cline. The **vote** was **unanimous for**.

Mr. Knox made a motion, seconded by Mr. Conroy, to close the hearing. The **vote** was **unanimous for**.

**Public Hearing (7:15)** – To amend the Zoning By-law Section 2.0 Definitions by adding additional definitions related to signs and deleting the existing Section 6.6 Sign Regulations and replacing it with a new Section 6.6 Sign Regulations which would include Sub-sections 6.6.1 Purpose, 6.6.2 Permit Required, 6.6.3 General Sign Regulations, 6.6.4 Exemptions, 6.6.5

**Temporary Signs, 6.6.6 Special Permits, 6.6.7 General Sign Prohibitions, 6.6.8 Removal of Signs, 6.6.9 Nonconforming Signs, 6.6.10 Administration, Violations, Appeals.**

Mr. Knox motioned to open Public hearing #2 and read the summary into the record. He asked for comments from Planning Board members. Ms. MacEachern said under 6.6.3.7, the way it reads was incorrect and states “the colors red, green, or yellow should not be used in a manner that might confuse the meaning or stops signs.” She would like to make the correction the “or” should be “of.” She added in regards to 6.6.7.9 “banners, pennants, ribbons, streamers, spinners, balloons, and strings of light.” She did not want it to sound like they are saying outdoor dining areas cannot have strings of lights or an establishment could not put balloons outside for a special occasion. She thought originally this had been tied to something else in regards to political signs. She felt as it read now, it did not really apply to signs. Mr. Resnick said that some communities do have this because they do not want banners and pennants, etc., because they don’t want those types of things.

After discussion, Ms. MacEachern asked if this is something they might want to strike out, or perhaps, require a Special Permit. Mr. Knox said rather than going to Town Meeting with multiple amendments, they may want to send a letter to the Zoning Enforcement Officer (ZEO) to clarify the intent. They may then want to strike it at a fall Town Meeting. Mr. Orrall noted that an Article can be modified until a motion is made on the floor. Minor changes do not really change the scope of the Article. Mr. Resnick said that he has always made changes through an amendment.

Mr. Knox asked the Board about 6.6.7.9 regarding banners, pennants, ribbons, etc. Should that be stricken or left in? After polling the Board, members agreed it should be stricken. Mr. Knox asked if there were any comments from the public. Mr. Orrall asked regarding 6.6.4.2 that political signs were exempt. Mr. Resnick said that was correct because of the free speech nature of political signs.

Mr. Knox made a motion, seconded by Mr. Conroy to recommend approval of the sign bylaw with an amendment to replace the word “or” with the word “of” in 6.6.3.7 and strike 6.6.7.9 from it. The vote was **unanimous for**.

Mr. Knox made a motion to close the hearing for the amended sign bylaw. It was seconded by Mr. Conroy. The vote was **unanimous for**.

**Public Hearing (7:25) – To amend the Zoning By-Law by adding a new Section 7.10 Open Space Residential Development which would allow by Special Permit the approval of a subdivision plan that allows the reduction of lot size provided the same number of lots are proposed and the remaining land is set aside as open space. Included would be the following Sub-sections 7.10.1 Purpose, 7.10.2 Special Permit Required, 7.10.3 Pre-Application Meeting, 7.10.4 Dimensional and Design Requirements, 7.10.5 Dedicated Open Space, 7.10.6 Ownership of Dedicated Open Space, 7.10.7 Preliminary Subdivision and OSRD Concept Plan Application Process, 7.10.8 Special Permit Application and Filings, 7.10.9 Special Permit Decisions, 7.10.10 Approval Criteria, 7.10.11 Revisions to Approved Special Permits.**

Mr. Knox made a motion to open Public hearing #3 and then read the summary into the record. It was seconded by Mr. Conroy. The **vote was unanimous for**. He asked if there were any comments from Planning Board members. There were none. He then opened the hearing to public comment.

Ms. Nancy Yeatts of 19 Twin Oaks Road stated that she was on the Conservation Commission but she was not representing the Commission. She was concerned about the references to it in the proposed bylaw. She first asked if this had been reviewed by Town Counsel. Mr. Resnick said that it had. She then asked what other Towns had been looked at. It appears this had been fashioned after the Town of Foxborough which is not comparable to Lakeville. Mr. Resnick said that he had also reviewed Middleborough, Plymouth, and some Towns to the south of Lakeville. He looked at some medium sized communities like Foxborough which is only a few thousand people greater than Lakeville. It has an Open Space Residential Development (OSRD) bylaw that has worked well. This bylaw is a compilation and rewording of many of those that he looked at.

Ms. Yeatts asked if there had been any comments from other Boards. This had only recently been on the agenda of the Conservation Commission. She said that at this late point, it would be hard to make any changes to it. She said there had been a meeting in regards to the Grant she is working on and just by adding additional wording could help that MVP Grant. She would like time to get recommendations from different boards as well as maintenance standards from the Highway Department. Mr. Knox noted that the Board has been reviewing this for three months. Ms. Yeatts replied that it never went to ConComm and comments had not been requested. Mr. Resnick said that he had met with Mr. Bouchard, the Agent, who received a copy of the document and reviewed it with him. He had also talked with the Highway Department and this has been mentioned multiple times at staff meetings which include all the department heads.

Mr. Knox advised any subdivision plan goes through the Highway Department for comment. Ms. Yeatts said they are talking about different pieces of property around Town. That is going to have to be maintained by someone and there is nothing in this bylaw about the Homeowner's Association as being an option. Mr. Knox said they have discussed that. It might be an amendment because it seems like Conservation does not want to have a Conservation restriction. Mr. Resnick said that his experience with the open space that goes along with an OSRD is that the people that live there are vested in these properties. Most are not abused or used as dump sites, therefore, they do not require a high level of maintenance.

Mr. Orrall asked if part of the question concerning the Highway Department is the option to make the open space a park because the Highway Department maintains the parks. Mr. Knox replied when a development would come to them with this proposal, that is when they would circulate the plans and have the various Boards that would be involved vote on a recommendation. If nobody is interested, then maybe they put it back on the developer to reimplement the Homeowners Association to manage and maintain the open space. He added that they don't really know all those answers until a developer comes in front of them. They would need legal guidance to make sure that it does stay as open space in perpetuity. They had felt the conservation restriction was the best way to ensure that. Ms. Yeatts said that is different from Conservation being in charge of it. Mr. Knox replied that if they wanted to put a conservation restriction on it and the Lakeville

Conservation Commission hold that, then they could have the Homeowners Association pay for the maintenance. Is that an option? Ms. Yeatts said someone would have to take this on, and they only have a part time agent.

Ms. Yeatts said that if they were going to have the Homeowners Association, she did not think the ownership of the dedicated open space is strong enough. In other bylaws she has looked at, it is called out that it shall permanently be protected pursuant to Article 97. It also refers to General Law, Chapter 184, a restrictive covenant. She thought that these laws had to be defined in order to hold the Homeowners Association to it. Article 97 land can only be changed from that open space by an Act of two thirds of the Legislature. She thought stronger language was needed. Mr. Resnick responded he thought it would require a little more than what they can modify here. He would recommend they move this forward, and then work through some amendments to submit for the fall Town meeting. Mr. Orrall added the only concern would be if it is adopted at Town Meeting, then in between that time and the fall meeting, someone could come in and get under what is current. Mr. Knox said that it is also by Special Permit and not by right. The Planning Board would have the ability to control it.

Ms. Yeatts said she had noticed that many communities are allowing this by right. Mr. Resnick replied that communities are doing that because the State is pushing it. In certain grant applications, you can get extra points if it is by right as opposed to Special Permit. Mr. Knox added that the intent is to get this right, and they are more than willing to start the conversation right away. Ms. MacEachern thought it would be good if this would allow them to get more grant money. However, what if this would allow a property that was undevelopable in a certain area to now move forward and be developed. Mr. Resnick clarified that the developability of the property must be proved. They have to show in a preliminary plan that they would be able to build in the conventional way first. With that submittal, there will be a concept plan for the open space development. If both items are approved, then it can move forward.

Mr. Orrall then asked under 7.10.4, number 2, it was not clear if you could use the open space portion for septic and wells. Mr. Resnick replied they have to be able to prove that the open space portion could support septic systems. They would have to come in with some soil mapping and comments for the Board of Health stating the acreage they want to give to them can support septic systems, but they cannot be placed on the open space. Mr. Orrall also asked for an explanation of number 4, reduced frontage. Mr. Resnick replied the Board had looked at a variety of plans. Mr. Knox said their intent was to mirror half of what the Town is at currently. They chose 100 feet, but with this incentive if they had a road with bends on it maybe on those outside corners you could still create that front yard circle type situation but with smaller frontage. They would only allow that on 20% of the lots, figuring it couldn't be done everywhere. They would then be incentivized to utilize some of those corner lots.

Mr. Orrall then asked about the width of the lot if there was only 50 feet of frontage. Mr. Resnick replied it states the width of each lot shall not be reduced to less than the required frontage to the street to the building site. It can be 50 feet up to where the building site is and then it widens out.

Mr. Orrall said under 7.10.5, number 1, a minimum of 50% of the upland area of the parcel shall become open space. This seemed unclear. Did parcel mean the original parcel and not the lot? Mr. Resnick said yes. Mr. Orrall noted that he had worked on this type of bylaw many years ago. He felt it was good for the Town despite some of the little nuances they still need to work out. Ms. Yeatts asked how the 40% lot coverage had been determined. Mr. Knox replied because the lots are small, they had determined the square footage of a house, driveway, patio, etc., and then used that amount for the coverage calculation. Ms. Yeatts asked what was the Board of Health's reaction to this. Mr. Resnick replied that during the Definitive Subdivision process, they will review the location of the wells and septic systems to ensure that there is proper separation. He noted that there is only a 100-foot separation requirement between a well and septic system, and the developer would have to design the layout to meet that.

Mr. Knox made a motion, seconded by Mr. Lynch to close the hearing and recommend approval of Section 7.10 Open Space Residential Development. The vote was **unanimous for**.

Ms. Yeatts then stated she thought they were going to wait until fall Town Meeting. Mr. Knox replied that would be to amend it. They will work with her now to get those amendments going.

**Public Hearing (7:35) – To amend the Zoning By-Law Section 7.4.6 Specific Uses by Special Permit, Auto or Boat sales, rentals, or service by deleting Industrial Districts and replacing it with Business District.**

Mr. Knox made a motion, seconded by Mr. Conroy, to open Public hearing #4. The vote was **unanimous for**. He read the legal ad into the record. He advised this was a housekeeping item. Mr. Resnick said that was correct. The change was made in the use chart, but it was overlooked in this section for Special Permits and uses.

Mr. Knox made a motion, seconded by Mr. Lynch, to close the hearing and recommend approval of this 7.4 Special Permit amendment. The vote was **unanimous for**.

**Site Plan Review - 2 Bedford Street**– Thomas J. Parenteau of PBT Real Estate - applicant

Mr. Knox stated they had received a request from the applicant to continue. He then made a motion, seconded by Mr. Lynch, to continue the Site Plan Review for 2 Bedford Street until their May 26, 2022, meeting at 7:00 p.m. The vote was **unanimous for**.

**Site Plan Review – 156 Rhode Island Road, continued – T. Sikorski Realty, LLC – applicant**

Mr. Knox said they also had a request from the applicant to continue this Site Plan Review. He made a motion, seconded by Mr. Lynch, to continue the Site Plan Review for 156 Rhode Island Road until their May 26, 2022, meeting at 7:00 p.m. The vote was **unanimous for**.

## Site Plan Review – 310 Kenneth W. Welch Drive

Mr. Terrence Russell was present. He advised he was an architect with Epstein located at 600 W. Fulton Street in Chicago and representing Jushi. Ms. Gwen Cortez, civil engineer, from Epstein was also present and representing Vega, the landlord. Mr. Russell said their purpose tonight was to provide the Board with an update on what they have been doing since last March. Since that time, Vega Strategic, the new building owner, hired Epstein to look at the entire site. Previously, they had only been working on the Jushi portion.

Mr. Russell said there were a number of review comments, one specifically in regards to the wetland delineation. There were also comments about coverage, materials, and overall parking. Since then, they have hired a civil engineer who completed the survey workforce, finding the grades, and they even found the original engineer who did the first wetland delineation. Ms. Cortez will review those findings later. They have an idea of what they need to do to accommodate parking for Northeast Alternatives, the other tenant in the building. Tonight, they have a concept site plan to review with the Board.

Ms. Cortez stated they hired the wetland consultant who had done the previous delineation. He went out on site and reported that while the wetland looks the same for design purposes; they can start working on things assuming the same boundaries. However, some of the flags are missing and it will need to be re-delineated. He will redo that for them, and they will get those results prior to re-submitting. For now, they are proceeding with their concept design with the assumption the wetland is in the same place. Ms. Cortez advised the plan she is displaying has four different colors because there are four different issues they are trying to address.

Ms. Cortez advised the original item they started with was the lack of parking with the Jushi tenant indicated in green down on the south east corner. The compressed natural gas generator pad that was created and built, but was not permitted is in yellow. They are coming back in with that to get it fully permitted. They continue to gather information on it, some of the equipment, and the plans that were created before so they can submit that for permit. Another issue is the fire lane, which is in red. It is not in good condition right now. They are proposing paving it with recycled asphalt and maintaining the overgrown landscaping to make sure it meets a minimum 11-foot width. They also want to give it a little bit more defined routing.

Ms. Cortez advised the final issue is the area in blue on the west end, which is the severe lack of parking for the Northeast Alternatives client. They have been trying to explore how they can build out their parking to meet their employee shift count needs. She has some parking tables on the bottom of the plan. For the Jushi side, they are proposing the creation of a total of 20 additional spaces. This includes reconfiguring the parking to be more efficient and more usable. For the Northeast Alternatives side, they are creating 60 new spaces and reconfiguring the rest. They will have a total of 79 regular spaces with 5 ADA spaces on the total site.

Ms. Cortez said the lot coverage is an issue. There is wetland covering the whole back area of the site. The plan as shown is at 72.4% coverage with 72.6% proposed. She believed the maximum

allowed is 70%. Mr. Knox asked if there was a mechanism through the Zoning Board of Appeals to seek a Variance for lot coverage. Mr. Resnick replied you can request relief from the Zoning By-law. The hardship might be the fact that the building exists already, and it had been permitted with small parking lots. He said there were arguments to be made to support that but to go over the 70%, they would have to go to the ZBA.

Mr. Knox said he liked what they had done on the Northeast Alternatives side of the building. It was a huge improvement from what is there. Ms. Cortez pointed out on the survey of that side of the building where that new parking would be located, and what the impact would be. There is a lot of brush in the area, but it does not look like it is great quality. They are staying away from the wetland and the berm. There are a lot of trees in that area, and she wanted to bring it up in case the Board wanted them to relocate those trees.

Mr. Knox said he was familiar with the area. In his opinion, he did not think they had to go to great lengths to establish the trees out of there. Mr. Russell added that once they have an okay on their direction to proceed, they will hire a local landscape architect to design additional landscaping for those areas. Mr. Knox replied to be at that 70% lot coverage, there are those two components; the nice landscape and attractive building. Mr. Conroy asked for a clarification on the 11 feet for the fire exit. Ms. Cortez showed the spot where the cooling tower is and explained the 11 feet is between the face of that tower and the plant material. There is a drop off very shortly after that. She said if they expanded it, it would go into the wetlands.

Mr. Conroy said he would like the Fire Chief to see this and have a simulation of a fire truck getting past there. Ms. Cortez said that she has run an auto turn past it, and it is definitely tight. Mr. Russell noted that there is some piping that goes from one of the tanks about 10 feet up and two feet over the fire lane. Mr. Conroy asked when you transition from Zone A into the fire lane, it was originally drawn with several parking spaces. Ms. Cortez said there were no plans for parking in that area. Those seven spaces are not being used by Jushi, and they are not striped out there. She had been told they existed, so she placed them on the drawing. One of the other tenants had been parking a couple of cars back there, but it is all up against the edge of pavement. Mr. Conroy noted if there was an 18-wheeler at the loading dock it could obstruct the fire lane. Ms. Cortez said she saw the concern and could verify that.

Mr. Knox asked about the jersey barriers that show for the concrete pad where the natural gas trailers will go, is there enough room with those spaces there to actually swing a truck to back in? He was under the impression that there will be more than one trailer in that corral. Ms. Cortez said she believed that they would want to have more than one trailer in the corral. She is trying to get more information regarding the size of the vehicles bringing in the gas, because she wants to show the maneuvering there. Those seven spaces may not be realistic in the end.

Ms. MacEachern asked if a permit has to be pulled for the gas generators. Ms. Cortez said her understanding is that it was built without a permit, and the new building owner would like it to be permitted now. Ms. MacEachern said she was in conversation with the Cannabis Control Commission (CCC) and was told they would have to go back to them for a structure change. It



was advised that they had provided Jushi with the latest Site Plan and the latest building plans specifically for the CCC. They will need to verify that.

Mr. Knox said that this is the fourth or fifth Site Plan Review they have seen on this property in three years. He noted that they just want to make sure that all of these things get caught now, and that everybody is on the same page. Mr. Russell said the building owner is aware the generators were not permitted and part of their contract with them is to get them permitted. Ms. MacEachern asked if any consideration had been put into some other type of power source. Mr. Russell said they were working with Middleborough Power, the Building Commissioner, as well as a local electrical contractor on increasing the amount of power coming to the building. When asked, he said that they have not looked at solar because these buildings use a lot of power. The issue with solar in the north is that they have a lot of cloudy days.

Mr. Knox said the Building Commissioner had noted the property maintenance company was trying to get a trailer on site. Mr. Resnick clarified it was a temporary construction trailer for a period of six months. He said towards the middle of the building, just to the right of a pad where there is a set of doors, there is an empty space where they would like to put the temporary construction trailer for the property owner's manager. Mr. Knox wanted the record to show that they did not want that to become permanent. Mr. Resnick said that he would recommend that it only be allowed for six months. What the property owner needs to do is carve out a small office space inside for a property manager or for someone who might come by as they cannot go into the two other facilities because there are strict security protocols. Mr. Russell said he understood the Board's frustration, but the new building owner is trying to get everything done.

Mr. Resnick added they have also been working with the Fire Chief on this. He has been at a couple of meetings and they have toured the new compressed natural gas facility. He thought that the fire alarm box locations had also been discussed. It appears the new owners are working cooperatively with the Fire Department. Mr. Knox asked if they were confident that this would rectify the parking across the street. Ms. Cortez replied that she was confident that she had maxed out the functional parking on the site, without impacting the wetlands, the storm issues, or the existing draining. The only other option they would have is if they wanted to cover more of the lot and try to get better parking and have more curb access. Mr. Knox asked how many spaces from what is proposed to what is currently there today with the temporary. Ms. Cortez said the temporary spaces counted on head to head double parking, and they were smaller spaces. She wasn't sure of the number. This plan is for 20 more spaces. Mr. Russell said they are also looking at providing parking lot lighting, so they will be doing a photometric study.

Regarding the Northeast side, Mr. Resnick asked if they were going to have a new entrance in the back for their employees. Ms. Cortez indicated where they believed the main entrance was located as well as an additional location for an entrance. There is a new solid door that has been cut into the brick. Mr. Russell said they are still not really familiar with their operation. There is a door in the back that they hope can be made into an accessible door. Mr. Resnick asked if they were aware of any plan to redesign or create a main entrance for the staff. Mr. Russell said that is their next discussion. They had gotten a set of plans that showed a main entrance facing Kenneth Welch

Drive. However, when you look at the building none of that has been built. They showed this plan to the building owners yesterday, but the next step is to present this to Northeast Alternatives and get their input, and vet out those additional concerns.

Mr. Knox asked if they would be filing with Conservation to do the work for the parking area. Ms. Cortez said she believed they needed to. Mr. Russell said in regards to an earlier conversation about signs that there are existing signs at each location. The building owner will probably put up two new signs, one for Jushi and one for Northeast Alternatives. Mr. Knox said it looked like they were making good progress. Mr. Russell said what they need tonight is an extension on the temporary parking. Mr. Knox asked Mr. Resnick what he would recommend. He asked Mr. Russell how much time they would need. Mr. Russell replied if they could get approval on a concept design and all of the engineering done by mid-July, they would have a couple of weeks to bid it. They would then be looking at sometime in August to start on the permanent changes. Mr. Resnick said that he would then recommend another 60 days to come back in for a final review.

After further discussion, Mr. Knox said it seem prudent to extend the parking 90 days which would put them at mid-August. He then made a motion, seconded by Mr. Lynch, to extend the temporary approval on the temporary parking for 90 days from today until mid-August. The vote was **unanimous for**.

#### Approve Meeting Minutes

Ms. Cline made a motion, seconded by Ms. MacEachern, to approve the Minutes from the April 21, 2022, meeting. The vote was **unanimous for**.

#### Next meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for May 26, 2022, at 7:00 p.m. in the Lakeville Police Station meeting room.

Mr. Knox noted that he would like to repeat the motions for opening the public hearings to ensure that all had been stated correctly.

Mr. Knox made a motion, seconded by Mr. Lynch, to open the public hearing to amend the Zoning By-law Section 6.7 Site Plan Review by deleting the existing section and replacing it with a new Section 6.7 Site Plan Review which would include Sub-sections 6.7.1 Purpose, 6.7.2 Authority, 6.7.3 Applicability, 6.7.4 Submittal Requirements, 6.7.5 Review Procedure, 6.7.6 Performance Standards, 6.7.7 Architectural Requirements, and 6.7.8 Decision, Inspection, Fees and Appeals. The vote was **unanimous for**. Mr. Knox said there had been a lengthy discussion regarding this amendment.

He then restated the motion that had been made originally. Mr. Knox made a motion, to make an amendment to add Open Space to the review Board list and amend performance standards to include 6.7.1.1 from the previous Site Plan Review Bylaw. He made a motion to recommend

approval of the Site Plan Review bylaw with those amendments for the new 6.7 Site Plan Review bylaw. It was seconded by Mr. Lynch. The **vote** was **unanimous for**.

Mr. Knox made a motion, seconded by Ms. MacEachern, to close the hearing. The **vote** was **unanimous for**.

### **Adjourn**

Mr. Knox made a motion, seconded by Mr. Conroy, to adjourn the meeting. The **vote** was **unanimous for**.

Meeting adjourned at 9:23.