

SUTTON PLANNING BOARD

Meeting Minutes

March 22, 2021

Approved

W. Baker

*Note- This meeting was held remotely via Zoom in accordance with Executive Orders from Governor Baker. The Chairman read a notice regarding the remote meeting format. (see end of minutes)

Present: W. Baker, M. Gagan, R. Largess Jr., K. Bergeson., W Talcott (Associate)

Absent: S. Paul

Staff: J. Hager, Planning & Economic Development Director

W. Talcott acted as a full member in Scott Paul's absence.

Public Hearing – Retreat Lot – 104 Mendon Road

W. Baker read the hearing notice as it appeared in The Millbury Sutton Chronicle.

Applicant Mark Stevenson was present to explain he wants to designate this existing lot as a retreat lot so he can use it for a one-bedroom single family home.

W. Baker read department comments including Fire Dept, Assessors, and Tax Collector.

Gerald Dahlstrom of 178 Putnam Hill Road asked questions about the potential placement and size of the home.

J. Hager stated the minimum width needs to be verified to be at least 50', the notation that the lot will never be subdivided needs to be added to the plan, and it appears the applicant may need to adjust the area of the lot to achieve a regularity factor that is at least .4 as right now it is only .34. Therefore, the applicant will need some time to try to resolve these issues or withdraw the application.

The Board briefly discussed an issue with the scheduled April meetings.

Motion: To move the April 5th meeting to April 12th, cancel the meeting on April 19th as this is a State holiday, and not have a meeting on April 26th unless absolutely necessary, M. Gagan
2nd: K. Bergeson

Janice Dahlstrom from 178 Putnam Hill Road asked if the abutters would be notified of the continuance. J. Hager stated they would not be notified directly but could call the Planning Office or go to the Planning Board page to get the Zoom link for this continued hearing.

Motion: To continue the public hearing to 7 PM on April 12, 2021, K. Bergeson
2nd: M. Gagan
Vote: 5-0-0: W. Baker- aye, M. Gagan – aye, R. Largess Jr. – aye, K. Bergeson –aye,
W. Talcott - aye

Public Discussion – Site Plan Waiver Request – Country Montessori – 30 Burbank Road

M. Gagan read the meeting notice that was sent to abutters within 300' of the property at the request of the Board.

Owner Laura Katragjini explained she intends to add one additional classroom for grades 1-4 with up to 20 students. In accordance with the State Department of Education limits she will then be allowed to have up to 80 students on premises in her 4 classrooms at one time. She will be utilizing space previously occupied by the Eaton Candy Shop and production area which is now gone. She noted with the store being gone, combined with her re-structuring of the program to a largely all day program, results in less traffic during various times of day.

James Marran of 80 Burbank Road stated traffic is his main concern. He noted he lives at the constrained intersection of Burbank and Sibley Roads which is not wide enough for two cars. He felt any increase in traffic poses a property damage and safety issue at this intersection on these scenic roadways.

Ms. Katragjini stressed when the candy shop was open and the school was under different ownership there were as many as 120 students with four staggered pick up and drop off times for a large amount of part time students. She stated now the program is largely a 9-3 PM program with over 60% of students going full-day. The structure is more that of a school not a child care facility. She noted there are also no trucks delivering to the business now and no customers coming and going.

Mr. Marran noted that based on what Ms. Katragjini had stated, more cars will be on the roadway during peak hours. Ms. Katragjini questioned if most students were coming through this intersection? Mr. Marran stated he does not know what the distribution is but that he does see cars with children coming and then returning with no children. Ms. Katragjini stated, particularly as most students enrolled for the new classroom are siblings of students already going to the school, she did not think there would be much if any additional impact here.

Mr. Marran noted the use table says "for profit" schools aren't allowed here, so even if this is a pre-existing non-conforming use it needs special relief for this expansion. J. Hager explained the "for profit" type of school referred to in the bylaw are for instance a beautician school or truck driving school. Basic education schools, preschools, and day cares, etc. of this type are protected uses under Massachusetts State Law and can only be reasonably regulated, not prohibited.

Mr. Marran stated the dangerous situation at this intersection needs to be acknowledged and means to reduce impact, like carpooling should be considered. He also expressed concerns with parking for events like events, recitals, etc.

K. Bergeson felt strongly that unless a family lived north along Burbank Road or perhaps on Sibley, they would not be going through this intersection.

M. Gagan stated the Planning Board is concerned about impacts on this intersection like the Singletary Arms project in Millbury and have put their concerns in writing.

R. Largess Jr. felt strongly that someone would only try to go through this intersection once as a short-cut or cut through and never again.

Mark Brown of 32 Burbank Road expressed concerns with water or sewer changes. He also stressed that parents shoot out of this driveway all the time without considering traffic on Burbank Road. K Bergeson surmised that there was far greater water and septic use when the candy shop was open. He asked if there is any signage exiting the driveway. There is not.

C. Hicks of 56 Burbank Road confirmed she has almost been hit multiple times from parents existing and just not paying attention and looking before they pull into Burbank.

Ms. Katragjini confirmed she has been in touch with the Board of Health. As a public water supply wellhead they are allowed to use 2,030 gpd of water. They currently use approximately 278 gpd.

- Motion: To grant the Site Plan Waiver and allow an additional classroom at 30 Burbank Road with the following conditions: K. Bergeson
- Approvals of all other applicable departments, boards, and especially the Sutton Board of Health and Sutton Fire Department.
 - The applicant will work with the Town to install signage at the end of the driveway cautioning users to be aware of and yield to oncoming traffic on Burbank Road
- 2nd: R. Largess Jr.

Ms. Katragjini noted the driveway is not owned by her so she can't guarantee the owner will let her install a sign. W. Baker stressed the Board had concerns with Singletary Arms and expressed them and it was noted there are ongoing efforts working with CMRPC and others to evaluate traffic volumes at this intersection and consider safety improvements.

Vote: 5-0-0: W. Baker- aye, M. Gagan – aye, R. Largess, Jr. – aye, K. Bergeson –aye,
W. Talcott - aye

Public Hearing – Proposed Bylaw Changes Spring 2021

W. Baker read the hearing notice as it appeared in The Telegram and Gazette. He did not read a description of each article as the Board will go through the articles one by one.

Article A (1)

Amend the Zoning Bylaw to change all instances of the term “Selectmen” or “Board of Selectmen” to “Select Board”. This article is a policy decision that will be sponsored by the Selectmen.

- Motion: To recommend that Town Meeting approve this article, K. Bergeson
- 2nd: R. Largess, Jr.
- Vote: 5-0-0: W. Baker- aye, M. Gagan – aye, R. Largess Jr. – aye, K. Bergeson –aye,
W. Talcott - aye

Article B (2)

To allow within the Office Light Industrial (OLI) District medical marijuana uses by right and adult use marijuana uses by Special Permit from the Planning Board, except adult use retail and on-site consumption which is prohibited.

J. Hager explained as the existing Marijuana Business Overlay District (MBOD) is fully occupied, if the Town does not provide an alternate location where these uses can be established then there is a risk that an operator could challenge the Town that they can go anywhere. The thought is this risk should be eliminated so the Town doesn't waste money on legal challenges. Additionally, these uses exist in every surrounding Town so Sutton has related impacts with no benefits. Finally, adding the uses to the OLI District was considered a good choice as there are large parcels where the uses could be located with little or no impact. At the request of the M. Gagan, the Zoning Map was shown with a summary of acreage in each district. J. Hager showed where the current MBOD is within the OLI District.

Kat Damaso-Azzarone of 21 Jared Drive asked if the Board had considered other districts than OLI. The Board considered all non-residential districts, but was influenced by commentary during original approval

of the uses that residents didn't want these uses very visible which they would be in the Business and Industrial Districts along Route 146.

Douglas Biggs of 44 Marble Road stated the Town has a district where the use is allowed and stated the area should not be increased as the business is a net negative. The Town would be better off to fight a challenge that just roll over and let them in.

The majority of the Board did not think it was wise to risk legal issues but to plan ahead instead.

Motion: To recommend that Town Meeting approve this article, R. Largess Jr.
 2nd: K. Bergeson
 Vote: 5-0-0: W. Baker- aye, M. Gagan – aye, R. Largess, Jr. – aye, K. Bergeson –aye,
 W. Talcott - aye

Article C (3)

To eliminate the prohibition on buildings within 25' of the Town line within the Office Light Industrial (OLI) Districts.

J. Hager explained at the request of the Board of Assessors a few years ago to cut down on valuation/taxation arguments with abutting towns, the Planning Board enacted this regulation. However, they did not consider that there are significant sized parcels in the largely undeveloped OLI areas of Sutton that reach across town lines. Eliminating the 25' separation to the Town line in these areas will allow the orderly and maximum utilization of this limited area for job and tax base creation. The Board is not recommending this change in residential districts where structures are considerably smaller and should be able to be adjusted to maintain the requested separation.

K. Bergeson said he felt it would be doing a disservice to tax payers to forego the larger structures that might be prohibited if this regulation remains.

W. Talcott noted if structures have to be shifted away from town lines, Sutton might actually end up with all the impacts and none of the benefit of structures near town lines.

Matthew Most of 8 Jenna Lane asked as many of the proposed bylaw changes appear to be related to a current development in South Sutton perhaps they can be discussed all together. He also noted the neighborhood had submitted a list of questions and concerns and asked if it might be appropriate to read/address those. K. Bergeson noted the Board was sent the neighborhood questions. They were also posted to the Planning Board website. J. Hager stated while bylaw changes may appear to be related to a particular development, that is rarely the case and not the case this year. She added she is trying to make sure questions from the neighborhood are addressed as discussion moves forward and comments noted.

Motion: To recommend that Town Meeting approve this article, K. Bergeson
 2nd: R. Largess, Jr.
 Vote: 5-0-0: W. Baker- aye, M. Gagan – aye, R. Largess Jr. – aye, K. Bergeson –aye,
 W. Talcott - aye

Article D (4)

To allow lots in the Industrial (I) Districts in Sutton to have reduced frontage of 100' when their frontage is fully located on the cul-de-sac bulb (defined in this article).

J. Hager explained the Board was asked by a potential business why this reduction isn't allowed in the Industrial (I) district. This proposed amendment is meant to maximize the amount of development that can occur within the Industrial District while maintaining a reasonable accommodation for access into every lot. This reduction has been allowed within the OLI Districts for many years. There is little

undeveloped land in the Industrial District and what is vacant has significant constraints so it will create little impact.

Motion: To recommend that Town Meeting approve this article, K. Bergeson
 2nd: R. Largess, Jr.
 Vote: 5-0-0: W. Baker- aye, M. Gagan – aye, R. Largess, Jr. – aye, K. Bergeson –aye,
 W. Talcott - aye

Article E (5)

To eliminate the requirement that all uses in the OLI District be on public water or sewer but to stipulate if private sewerage means are utilized the Towns aquifers must be protected by and O&M plan, the ability to conduct inspections and bonding if found to be necessary.

The vote was tabled until comments from Town Counsel could be read.

Article F (6)

To allow owners of adjacent legally non-conforming lots to seek a Special Permit from the Zoning Board of Appeals to become buildable.

J. Hager explained that a recent lawsuit had brought to light an issue of inequity. If a person owns two adjacent lots that are legally pre-existing non-conforming and one is vacant. If the owners were not aware of the MGL that states once a lot becomes non-conforming, the owner only has 5 years to utilize it, they are left holding a non-buildable lot after 5 years. The fact is if someone is not a Board member or planner or land use attorney, it's not likely they would know anything about this law. She showed the Board maps of potential exposure and stressed lots that qualify don't automatically become buildable. An owner must apply to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) and during that process after verifying the five base criteria, the ZBA must also find the vacant lot is substantially the same in size and frontage as other developed lots in the immediate area at which point they can grant a Special Permit to make the lot buildable.

Motion: To recommend that Town Meeting approve this article, K. Bergeson
 2nd: R. Largess, Jr.
 Vote: 5-0-0: W. Baker- aye, M. Gagan – aye, R. Largess Jr. – aye, K. Bergeson –aye,
 W. Talcott - aye

Article 7 (G)

To eliminate the requirement that retreat lots have to have three times the required upland. J. Hager explained the upland, or non-wetland, area requirement was meant to ensure there is enough dry land on a lot for the house, well and septic system with some extra land to replace the septic system if necessary. Both a standard lot and a retreat lot can only have one residential structure, therefore there is no reason for a retreat lot to be required to provide more upland than a standard lot.

Motion: To recommend that Town Meeting approve this article, W. Talcott
 2nd: K. Bergeson
 Vote: 5-0-0: W. Baker- aye, M. Gagan – aye, R. Largess, Jr. – aye, K. Bergeson –aye,
 W. Talcott - aye

Article 8 (H) – Article 14 (N)

To add uses, eliminate uses, change the permitting methods primarily within the OLI District but also in some other Districts as well.

To eliminate the definition of self-storage facility.

To add a definition of Brewery, Distillery, Winery; Service Companies; Manufacturing; Warehouse with Distribution; Package/Freight Delivery Company; and Fulfillment Center.

J. Hager explained this series of articles are meant to address the use of much of the remaining developable business/industrial land in Sutton. As noted earlier, less than 8% of Sutton's land area is zoned for business or industry and of this total acreage about 3%ish is zoned Office Light Industrial (OLI). More than 30 years ago Sutton voters zoned these areas as industrial and they are now starting to see activities. That time has come in Sutton, developers are expressing interest and buying parcels in this District. The Board feels it is important to ensure that the uses allowed in the OLI are those that have the best likelihood of creating tax base and/or a good amount of jobs. Additionally, there are uses not currently allowed that residents have expressed a desire for, uses that the Board wanted to encourage by easing permitting requirements, and/or uses that the Board felt needed to be clarified or differentiated from other uses. Therefore, they have eliminated and added uses and adjusted permitting requirements accordingly. There are a few cases where changes affect other districts as well, like when a use is eliminated altogether or a new use is proposed to be added to the table. The Board also feels it is important to define uses in that area listed in the Table and to clean up confusing definitions or use terms often by re-defining them or adding definitions and/or uses in the same use category to differentiate these uses. Definitions proposed were written by consulting the North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS), Central Massachusetts Regional Planning Commission and surrounding and other towns with the subject uses.

J. Hager quickly ran through proposed changes to the Use Table. She noted while listing examples/names of businesses that fit a particular definition seems helpful, Town Counsel recommends these be removed from definitions primarily as these businesses may change over time creating issues. The majority of the Board agreed the examples/names of businesses should be eliminated from proposed definitions.

Kat Damaso-Azzarone of 21 Jared Drive asked if warehouse with distribution and package/freight delivery are already allowed in the OLI District? J. Hager stated the Building Commissioner has issued a written determination that the use represented by Blackstone Logistics, essentially a warehouse with distribution, is an allowed use in the OLI District, it otherwise couldn't be in the public hearing process right now. Additionally, the current definition of Trucking service and warehousing lists UPS and Fed Ex, IE package/freight delivery companies, as example businesses. She added confusion over the term and definition is what the Board is trying to resolve so the Board has guidance, developers know what is and isn't allowed, and residents know what they are getting.

Ms. Damaso-Azzarone noted they knew they were buying near an OLI District but she did not think these uses were currently allowed and they are primarily what her family is concerned about due to potential disruption.

J. Hager added that past comments from South Sutton residents with concerns about Amazon in Milford is one reason the Board felt uses of this similar category should be clearly differentiated and defined. Because the use type Fulfillment Center has been causing local traffic safety issues in other communities, even though these locations aren't the same as Sutton locations, the Board felt it was important to define and for the time being effectively prohibit this use type until they can understand its impacts better and decide if a where it might function safely in Sutton.

Ms. Damaso-Azzarone confirmed the Building Commissioner's use ruling referenced above is final. Rebecca Laurie of 26 Dudley Road asked if the area west of the proposed rezoning will stay residential. J. Hager confirmed it would.

Article O (15)

To extend the Office Light Industrial (OLI) District westward to allow access to Boston Road for uses developed in this part of Sutton.

Through the Board's recent traffic modeling about the effects of development of this site on traffic conditions, the Board is aware that it is not safe to have all traffic exiting this site to Providence Road where it will then travel into Millbury center or South Grafton, and in large part need to pass through the intersection of Boston and Providence Roads to get to Route 146. This intersection in particular cannot handle this volume of traffic especially truck traffic. The Board felt it would be irresponsible not to re-zone a portion of the frontage of this acreage along Boston Road to allow alternate access directly to Boston Road close to Route 146 removing most, if not all traffic traveling to Route 146 from the Providence Road intersection and this more congested section of roadways. While approximately 81 acres is being re-zoned only about 32 acres is potentially developable. There is no intention to develop this acreage at this time with anything other than an access road.

B. Shank of 80 Dudley Road asked if something were to be proposed here in the future would there be subsequent meetings about that. J. Hager stated yes there would be a public hearing and anyone within 300' of the property lines of proposed development would be directly notified of these hearings. Nicole Bousquet of 78 Dudley Road asked if the development plans are available to view. J. Hager explained there are no actual development plans for this site, nothing has been filed with the Planning Board. There have only been preliminary conversations about what they would like to build on this site. The owners have been before the Conservation Commission for preliminary permitting of earth work necessary for development and she believed that permitting may have featured sketch plans.

Ms. Bousquet asked if the new owners knew the area near Boston Road was residential when they purchased the property, just as residential owners knew there was a substantial residential buffer to any potential industrial development when they bought their homes. J. Hager confirmed the new owners knew their zoning. She asked if the frontage on Dudley Road could be used by Atlas. J. Hager stated the reason for the proposed zoning change is because access can't go from the OLI to Boston Road through the Rural Residential Zone and likewise they can't access to Dudley Road with OLI uses. If someone proposes a re-zoning up to Dudley Road to OLI and Town Meeting approves that then OLI uses can exit to Dudley Road. That is not what is being proposed.

James LaPlante of 26 Heritage Road asked about Conservation input on the re-zoning. He noted the wellhead for the public water supply is in the middle of this area and there are wetlands. J. Hager stated Conservation only inputs on development proposals. She added the Site Plan review process as well as current and future conservation permitting reviews the potential impact on these resources. He asked if there will be traffic studies. She noted the Board already conducted traffic modeling for this area which have resulted in this re-zoning proposal. She also confirmed there will be project specific traffic studies. Dan Robertson of 126 Boston Road asked about Town Meeting. J. Hager stated Town Meeting is scheduled for Saturday, May 15th at 10 AM outside at the school complex on Boston Road. She noted there is a rain date but is not sure when that is but it will be listed on the Town Clerk's website.

Article P (16)

To allow an increase in height in the OLI Districts with a Special Permit from the Planning Board. J. Hager explained the Board had received various requests and informational materials about the current industry standards for manufacturing and related warehousing and the related economics of height. Today's standards call for higher instead of wider warehousing footprints in terms of costs and environmental impacts. Because much of the OLI District is comprised of large parcels where taller structures could be appropriately placed for minimal impact, the Board felt it was appropriate to allow the possibility of taller structures through a Special permit process. The Board heard commentary at the most recent Town meeting where a carte-blanche height increase was part of a larger re-zoning proposal and therefore they proposed a Special Permit process that provides for a broader approval process where the Board has the right of denial if impacts can't be mitigated. She noted any structure over 7,500 s.f. has to have a sprinkler system. J. Hager noted the Fire Chief input stating they didn't have an issue with a 70' height as several of their mutual aid communities have ladders of 95'+. The Building Commissioner also noted the height should stop at 69' since 70' triggers High Rise building Code requirements.

M. Most of 8 Jenna Lane asked why height is even being discussed again when it was denied at the last Town Meeting. He also asked how tax revenue is divided up when a building crosses town lines and how much we'll actually see from these developments. J. Hager noted there are plans on the books and a public hearing on-going since February about Blackstone Logistics in South Sutton with a split of 40% Sutton, 40% Uxbridge and 20% Douglas. Construction value is estimated at 48 million without land purchase for 640k s.f. and over 300 jobs. M. Gagan stressed that no actual company has been named but encouraged Mr. Most to attend. They have specified it will not be a fulfillment center. The towns have already agreed they will be hiring a professional appraiser not affiliated with any town to divvy up the tax proceeds. At any point an article can be brought back especially if it has been changed. In this case the Board has added a Special Permit, not allowing a carte blanche increase. The only time you can't bring an article back is within 2 years if the Planning board didn't recommend the change.

As the Planning Board sponsored and recommended the prior height article there is no restriction when height can be reconsidered. She added height adjustments are preliminarily being considered in response to conversations and education about the industry for OLI land in North east Sutton. K. Bergeson noted all surrounding towns have higher height which Sutton has to compete against or they will lose structures just over town lines. The structure Scannell is proposing in South Sutton is 45'.

Victoria Bruce of 38 Jenna Lane stated she understands the need for revenue but that it not be at the expense of the face of Sutton which 70' would do as that height doesn't represent our town. K. Bergeson encouraged residents to take a look at Gilmore Drive to look at what the Board considers appropriate as opposed to a big giant building with no character.

J. Hager reviewed and answered remaining questions from the Jenna/Jared neighborhood questions. She stated setbacks are not proposed to be changed from lot lines or zoning district boundaries. General concerns included noise, light and environmental pollution, negative effects on wildlife, traffic and disruption to the neighborhood. In Sutton there is no limit on tree cutting or clearing unless within Conservation jurisdiction. It is unlikely Jared would be closed off and the Board of Selectmen can be asked but as this would become a dead end over 500' which would not likely carry a recommendation of the safety department heads. She suggested they should probably request some signage.

K. Bergeson thanked the public for their constructive comments.

Motion: To table article E (5) until Fall Town Meeting, K. Bergeson
 2nd: R. Largess Jr.
 Vote: 4-1-0: W. Baker- aye, M. Gagan – aye, R. Largess, Jr. – aye, K. Bergeson – aye,
 W. Talcott – neigh wants it taken care of now

J. Hager read through the remaining Town Counsel comments/questions.

Motion: To recommend that Town Meeting approve articles H (8) – P (16) eliminating company names in articles 12-14, K. Bergeson
 2nd: R. Largess, Jr.
 Vote: 5-0-0: W. Baker- aye, M. Gagan – aye, R. Largess Jr. – aye, K. Bergeson – aye,
 W. Talcott - aye

Motion: To close the public hearing, M. Gagan
 2nd: K. Bergeson
 Vote: 5-0-0: W. Baker- aye, M. Gagan – aye, R. Largess Jr. – aye, K. Bergeson – aye,
 W. Talcott - aye

Chapter 61A Release – 24 Mumford Road: J. Hager noted previous owners Millie and Dan Gifford were so devoted to forestry that they worked with Metacomet Land trust to hold the conservation restriction on this land that is approved by the State. This is very difficult to revoke.

Motion: To recommend the Board of Selectmen pass over their first right of refusal and not purchase this land noting there is a state approved conservation restriction in place,
 R. Largess, Jr.
 2nd: K. Bergeson
 Vote: 5-0-0: W. Baker- aye, M. Gagan – aye, R. Largess Jr. – aye, K. Bergeson – aye,
 W. Talcott - aye

Administrative Items

Motion: To approve the minutes of 3/8/21, K. Bergeson
 2nd: M. Gagan
 Vote: 5-0-0: W. Baker – aye, M. Gagan – aye, R. Largess Jr. – aye, K. Bergeson – aye,
 W. Talcott – aye

Correspondence:

Singletary Arms in Millbury was narrowly approved. 180 dwelling units, 4,000 s.f. retail/office, and 2,400 s.f. restaurant and 327 parking spaces. Because the legislature reduced Special Permits for housing from super to simple majority this project passed where it otherwise would not have.

CMRPC will be adding this location to traffic counts this year and J. Hager is looking into cost for vehicle type count as well. In response to a question from K. Bergeson, she stated only the Board of Selectmen can change the intersection and this is the first step. J. Marran thanked the Board for their efforts and noted the Millbury Chair was sensitive to Sutton's concerns. He expressed continuing concerns with property damage incidents and the degradation of his National Register and Society for Antiquities property. He asked for any suggestions and offered his assistance in working toward a solution.

Oxford Bylaw Hearing – April 12th – including hotel, motels and country inns, changes to parking for Village District, scrapping cluster bylaw and replacing with Low Impact Development Bylaw

Grafton new marijuana dispensary – 130-134 Worcester Street

Motion: To adjourn, K. Bergeson
2nd: M. Gagan
Vote: 5-0-0: W. Baker- aye, M. Gagan – aye, R. Largess Jr. – aye, K. Bergeson –aye,
W. Talcott - aye

Adjourned 10:55 PM

Covid Meeting Statement: Due to the current COVID-19 Crisis (pursuant to Governor Baker's March 12, 2020 Order suspending certain provisions of the Open Meeting Law) this meeting is being held remotely via Zoom. To join the meeting visit www.zoom.us/join and Meeting ID: 898-9861-0976 Password: 106930. The meeting will be broadcast and recorded on local access stations and live streamed when available. Pursuant to MGL Chapter 30A Section 20, no person shall address a meeting of a public body without permission of the chair. Individuals who would like to participate should state their name and address after being recognized by the chairperson. In an effort to ensure transparency to our viewers at home, the chat function is not available.