

# Community Preservation Committee

February 16, 2023

Via Zoom Webinar

Meeting Minutes

## **Call to Order**

Katelyn Sullivan of the Planning Office announced the meeting would be recorded and broadcasted.

Chair Mike Dissette called a meeting of the Community Preservation Committee to order at 7:02 p.m.

## **Roll Call**

In attendance were Chair Mike Dissette, Vice Chair Jane Healey, Chuck Griffin, Jamie Gagnon, Joe Teixeira, Mark Rosen, Don Walters, and Joe Morgan. *Tom O'Brien not present.*

Katelyn Sullivan from the Planning Office was also present.

### **1. Welcome by the Chair**

Chair Mike Dissette welcomed everyone and reviewed the process of the presentations. Presentations should be limited to 10 min and then he will open the call for questions from the Committee members and Public. CPC members will not be doing any considerations or voting until the March 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting. He advised he will be assisting in the first 2 application presentations and handed the meeting over to Vice Chair Jane Healey to conduct.

### **2. Presentations**

VC Jane Healey opened the meeting and invited Chair Mike Dissette to begin his presentation.

#### **a) Open Space Reserve Fund**

City of Newburyport/Open Space Committee \$100,000

Mike Dissette reviewed this is an annual request to add to the available Open Space savings account to allow the Committee to act quickly when an opportunity presents itself. Requesting \$100,000 to be placed in the reserve savings to be used for separate considerations that come to the committee for Open Space projects. CPC has been able to maintain a balance in the fund and the money is not to be applied to any particular project at this time, reserves to go into the savings account. Any project to utilize funds from this savings needs to be presented and reviewed. The current balance in the reserve is \$729,966 with the \$100,000 to be added.

VC Jane Healey asked for questions from Committee

Don Walters questioned if the last time utilized the funds was in 2014?

Mike Dissette clarified that since 2014 they had 3 significant usages which he noted in his application.

Don Walters questioned if he recalled the amounts?

Mike Dissette provided the following: Colby Farms at \$250,000, Water Supply Protection about the same at \$250,000, and the Curzon Mill with two separate acquisitions for 2 lots totaling approximately \$300,000.

Don Walters advised he was trying to get a concept of when it may come to a point when a cap may be set/required.

VC Jane Healey called for questions from the Public- none.

b) Colby Farm Open Space Preservation

City of Newburyport/Open Space Committee \$51,000

Mike Dissette presented the application which is for land the City acquired behind the new cluster development behind Colby Farm Lane & Lowe St. Referred to map showing the 3 lots adjacent to each other 97-14, 97-16, & 97-17. He reviewed some history of the land which had horses and barn storage many years ago with an old horse track for racing; more recently used as a horse pasture and active hay fields. The City acquired the land and, in the acquisition, they also received the management plan put together by an outfit retained by the developer and shared management plan report with Conservation Commission. Conservation Commission now holds the Conservation restriction on this land and manages with the help of Matt Smith of Woodsman Inc. The Commission members & Matt Smith assisted in putting together this application and confirming effectual elements.

Proposal to include removal and replacement of old fencing along Low St to delineate the land and protect from incursion of any joy riders; new fencing starting at Colby Farm Ln entrance next to the development to the hay field to protect the wetland area (referred to map) and delineate the pathway.

Also, they would like to add a Public Education element with 2 signs; an identifier sign on Low St. and Kiosk with an educational sign about the values the uplands/lowlands/meadow lands serve as habitat and how it is being managed. Hopefully it will be enjoyed carefully by those using the walking path.

He referred to the attached budget received from Woodward Fence and Supply Co for fencing (removal & install). Additional numbers for the sign & kiosk come from similar projects and costs the City has experienced in other signage projects; includes cost for a graphic artist. Matt Smith has an existing contract with the City and has estimated time to supervise the construction and help lay out the walking path at approx. \$2,000. There is also a 10% contingency added in which takes the total cost to \$51,000.

Q: Don Walters requested he clarify the difference of maintenance vs capital infusion? Stuart had sent some emails to the City advising if projects had to do with maintenance it wasn't allowed to use CPC funds.

A: Mike Dissette confirmed when something is routine maintenance it is not intended for CPA supplement general funds in matters of routine maintenance for City assets. He clarified this project is a new capital investment both with the fencing to identify the entrance to the walking path and to invest in something on Low St to show appreciation and respect for the open space we own and manage.

Q: Don Walters explained he is the representative for the Planning Board which this project did come through. He recalled when it was put forth 3-4 yrs. ago, fencing was not discussed and had it been asked by the developer to make the improvements then

this may not be an issue now. He advised he will take this back to the Planning Board to avoid this scenario in the future.

Q: Jamie Gagnon commented he understood the Low St. fencing but questioned why the fencing on the other area was needed? He also questioned if it was needed behind the housing?

A: Mike Dissette explained it would work to define the entrance and separate it from the developed properties/housing. The fencing on the other side of the walkway would be to keep people off the meadow lands there, which is wet, and keep people on the path. It's not needed behind the houses as they are in the upland area and there is already some fencing there built by the developer on the property line.

Joe Teixeira added that there is a project for a pollinator field with black plastic covering it which is that length of the fence. The fence will help to avoid people entering and stepping on that area.

VC Jane Healey opened the call for questions from the Public.

Steve Moore- VC of Conservation Commission wanted to express his support to the project. He mentioned the Low St. fencing is falling over and with the horses gone the vegetation is overgrown. If the fence is removed it could be used to expand the hay fields, continuing the historic use of the land. Also, the fence along the pathway is needed to prevent people from walking on the pollinating field. The kiosk at the start of the path will give educational information to enlighten the public on what a pollinator field is and why it's important to the insects and butterflies on site.

c) Tree Replacement

Friends of Newburyport Trees \$7,200

Chair Mike Dissette welcomed Crispin Miller to present.

Crispin Miller explained the mission to raise money to preserve, protect, and replace as many trees as they can. Suggested in conjunction with the CPC rules which align with the project as trees are one of the City's "crown jewels". City would become an urban desert if trees were not replaced. Gave examples of decline of trees and how they have combatted this with funding received. Reviewed in 2021 removed 84 trees and planted 97 compared to 2022 where 77 were removed and 51 planted. He explained the measurements of the trees versus the number of trees related to recovery rate and how they are well behind in the area of measurement. Concluded with the importance of trees from a visual and health standpoint and asking for minimum 10 trees to be restored from what was lost.

Mike Dissette called for questions from Committee

Q. Don Walters questioned correspondence from the State, from Stuart.

A. Katelyn Sullivan responded they had reached out to the Community Preservation Coalition and were advised that this was more of a maintenance expense for the City which was communicated to the Friends of Newport Trees.

Crispin Miller commented that there is a big difference between maintenance and replacement /restoration and doesn't understand where the State is coming from as this is certainly a preservation project.

Q. Chair Mike Dissette questioned the address for the project, if it is 44 Jefferson St or Plummer, to confirm it was not his own.

A. Crispin Miller confirmed it was Plummer and not Mike's address. He commented on the number of trees taken down on just those 2 streets and if he lived there, he would be upset.

Q. Jamie Gagnon requested clarification on the process in regards to the State's comments and whether the project is eligible for CPC funding?

A. Katelyn Sullivan advised the CPC will need to vote based on the advice of the Coalition.

Crispin Miller commented that the CPC has funded in the past for trees on High St & Green St. which he has enjoyed. He is not sure why they wouldn't consider other places.

Q. Joe Morgan asked what is the normal funding source for tree replacement, is this the correct body to go to? What is the City's normal funding for maintenance and replacement of street trees?

A. Crispin Miller advised the Friends of Newburyport Trees raises funds and donates to the City and the funds are managed by the Tree Commission to plant trees. They also get donations and go out to other trusts and the sale of the City Guide to Trees that was published 1.5 years ago. The City also donated \$20,000 for planting and watering.

A. Mike Hennessey Parks Manager and certified arborist. He commented that a few trees on Plummer were removed due to a virus. He explained the bigger picture is the gaping holes created on the street which is related to the tree diameter and it is detrimental to the City to have missing trees. He added replacement in City trees is a capital improvement to the community at large and this seems like a simple ask to consider as improvement and Capital investment.

Q. Joe Teixeira questioned CPC past funding for planting trees. Can someone confirm when and how much was funded in the past without issue?

A. Chair Mike Dissette advised they have funded tree planting within existing parks, also High St & Green St using eligibility for restoration of the historic landscape and did not have information from the Coalition that the area where the trees were being planted, street tree would lack eligibility for not being on a historic site.

A. Katelyn Sullivan conferred, back in 2020 CPC recommended and City Council did allocate. Historic site being the hook.

Q. VC Jane Healey asked if they were working with the Tree Commission on this project?

A. Crispin Miller confirmed they are but their funding has dwindled and they are looking for other sourcing to get the funding to the Tree Commission. Friends do not plant, just raise money. Confirmed these trees were recommended by the Tree Commission to be replaced.

Chair Mike Dissette asked for questions from Public- none.

d) Mobi mats- Dune Preservation  
Plum Island Taxpayers Association (PITA) \$6,657

Nancy Barrett & Rosemary Janco presented. Requesting funding for Mobi mats for 53<sup>rd</sup> street, total of 3 fifty footers to support the dune conservation to the island. They will serve to provide a clear path for the Public and to keep people off the pathway, it will be handicapped accessible, and allow for emergency vehicles. Added they are ADA compliant and recyclable. DCA uses them throughout the State of Massachusetts. They received a quote from Mobi mats back in December 2022, and hope the price still stands. Included in the packet is a letter from PITA signed by Ron Barrett showing that in case not able to put them down or roll up to store, they will care for it. Also, in the event unable to dispose of PITA will care for it.

Q. Chair Mike Dissette questioned if this is the first time, they were placing mats in that area & longevity?

A. Nancy Barrett advised no; the existing mats are being reallocated to another access point on the island. This is a high traffic area and needs replacement and longer coverage. The longevity is good, only issues they've had is with the metal posts that hold them down. 53<sup>rd</sup> street most heavily traveled. The mats are put down Memorial Day and removed on Columbus Day. Preserves the dunes and keeps people off the sand.

Q. Mark Rosen questioned under which aspect of the CPC is being applied?

A. Rosemary Janco responded under recreation, which seemed to fit best.

Q. Mark Rosen asked how mats would provide recreation to the public.

A. Rosemary Janco explained the mats would allow access to the beach; without them you couldn't get buggies, kayaks or carriages to the beach. It makes it easy to access so this site has become very popular.

Q. Mark Rosen added his concern of this only serving a small number of people due to lack of public parking.

A. Rosemary Janco responded that was not true as there are many coming from other roads that access 53<sup>rd</sup>. Nancy mentioned she lives on 55<sup>th</sup> street and they have a constructed approach to the beach which is dangerous so they go to 53<sup>rd</sup> because it's easier & safer. They believe thousands are using this access, the most popular access. Trucks will pull up and use it as a drop off spot. They want to preserve it and keep it and they have a group helping to do that.

Q. VC Jane Healey requested clarification on the existing mats being reallocated; to where and why? She also questioned if there is public parking on the main road, how much and how far away, to estimate how many may access the site from outside the neighborhood?

A. Both explained the mats will go to another section of the beach that doesn't have Mobi mats to preserve all the dunes of the island. The mats do build up the sand over the season so a longer section is needed to get to the beach to protect them. They advised there is no public parking, mainly the neighbors. There is no public parking, only The Point has parking. There are many friends of neighbors, people will walk, ride bikes, drive all over the island to get there. They added it would be used for emergency access as well.

Q. Don Walters asked to be more specific of where the other mats will be repurposed. He added he was not trying to put the applicant in a disadvantaged position but if the mats were repurposed in another city, then it would not be appropriate for CPC to fund this. He referred to the Rail Trail as an example that caused an issue as a small space in Newbury was involved. Important to know/ be aware of where they will be placed.

A. Rosemary Janco advised she will find out.

Q. Chair Mike Dissette requested that the information be sent to Katelyn Sullivan.

A. Both responded yes.

Q. Chair Mike Dissette asked if there were any other access locations in Newburyport?

A. Nancy Barrett confirmed there is another on 57<sup>th</sup> and further down by piping work by DCR.

Chair Mike Dissette called for questions from Public- none.

e) Bike Feasibility Study

City of Newburyport Parks Commission & Department \$5,750

Ted Boretti of Parks Commission Chair advised requesting funds to hire a consultant for a feasibility study to assess various areas of Newburyport for an off-road biking track. He reviewed back in 2020 there was a request for March's Hill to be used for biking which came from a group of kids during COVID to get outside. The kids modified some trails and over the following year riders created extensive trails, jumps, and embankments. Trails expanded beyond footprints and abutters complained about noise, trash, and negative environmental impact. There were concerns of the jumps in the trail and the safety. To fulfill the promise of managing safety the Powderhill Trail Company was brought in to assess the condition of the trails and the site. They suggested expanding the search to other sites in Newburyport. The requested funds are to complete the search of a bigger area and assess 3-5 locations to suit biking with it being safer and environmentally friendly, and available to the Public. He emphasized the Parks Commission does view this as a critical component to reach consensus with the Public over what emerged last summer as a contentious issue. He reviewed March's Hill is still in use by kids and biking groups and by making them partners in maintaining the trails has allowed them to be stewards. He explained the application meets open space 1, 2 & 3, the 2017 Master Plan CR3, and numerous letters form stakeholder groups. He concluded by adding homemade biking trails existing in other trails; ample evidence of desire and a need for one that is well maintained and safe. This study is a crucial first step alleviating the burden in creating a facility for bikers of all ages to enjoy. He explained the cost would be \$1150 per site covering evaluation of up to 5 sites.

Q. Jaime Gagnon confirmed kids are still using the trails on their own and questioned if there was any prohibition on that? What areas are being considered. He added kids using ingenuity is great.

A. Ted Boretti responded yes, still allowed to ride in March's Hill. They have taken measures to prevent them from going beyond area allowed. They have posted rules and regulations for users to follow and to make sure they are using the area responsibly. Since things got heated last May, not nearly as many complaints now so those measures are taking hold. In response to other locations, he explained that will be the first step to

engage the consultant on. There are some ideas but nothing definite or specific space identified; the consultant will weigh in on that.

Q. Jamie Gagnon suggested some areas that they may want to look into.

Chair Mike Dissette opened for questions from the Public- none.

f) Cashman Multi-sport Courts Resurfacing

City of Newburyport Parks Commission & Department \$61,271

Kim Turner Manager of Special Projects of the Mayor's office. Started by stating this is identified as a priority project for this year to resurface the courts from tennis, basketball to multi-sport court to include pickleball. Provided history of the Park. 18 acres of various sports/recreation. Explained the existing courts have reached life span and are in significant decline.

Scope of the work consists of pressure washing and filling in cracks, installing a new repair system, repave, and paint. Other changes requested are to fill in the missing chain link fence, install a double gate for handicap accessibility, also a transparent windscreen and back board to allow play at all times and for solo play. She referred to images of the area's current state and advised they are requesting \$61,271 funds for this project. They have also received a private donation of \$15,000 which was accepted by the City Council. Reviewed the courts are used by Youth Services, residents, and visitors with an increase in recreation in parks over the past 2 years making the renovations a public benefit. Pickleball has rapidly grown and become very popular and this park is away from residents which will avoid noise complaints.

Q. Chair Mike Dissette asked when the surface was originally installed.

A. Kim Turner advised it is unclear the exact date of when courts and playgrounds were installed, guessing midcentury.

Q. Jamie Gagnon question if there any thoughts in expanding to another tennis or pickleball court?

A. Kim Turner responded that the off-leash dog park is very popular and only 1 of 3 in the city so there would be a significant impact of that use. The Parks Commission would have to consider it.

Q. Don Walters questioned when resurfacing is done is there something to differentiate tennis from pickleball. Appears pickleball is more favorable than tennis and may get more use, is there any type of resurfacing favoring pickleball?

A. Kim Turner advised it is her understanding that basketball or tennis courts can be used for pickleball and she is not aware of a different surface better suited.

Ted Boretti advised the Newburyport Pickleball committee is having a hard time finding a home and have been looking for new courts. Another reason for the high priority example is the summer pilot where they reserved hours for pickleball and it was fantastic. He agrees resurfacing to include pickleball will be a benefit and transforming the courts into multi-use courts throughout the city is needed, with this being a great start.

Q. Joe Teixeira questioned the size of the pickleball court and if the tennis court expanded towards the river would there be enough room for 2 courts side by side? If already doing work there and that is an option, it seems like you would want to take it.  
A. Kim Turner advised the Conservation Commission would need to answer and agreed it was an excellent question.

Q. Chair Mike Dissette asked what the life expectancy is of the new surface and what maintenance should be taken to reach that full life? Or will there be crack filling needed?

A. Kim Turner explained there is a 7–10-year life span and by putting down a good foundation it will allow it to withstand longer. Crack filling shouldn't be needed as the system has some give to resist NE weather.

Mike called for questions from Public- none.

g) Atkinson Common Tennis Court Resurfacing  
City of Newburyport Parks Commission & Department \$49,557

Kim Turner provides a brief history of the park having 21 acres with the court surface installed around 1973. She referred to the Cashman project explaining the circumstances are the same but with this park having 3 courts so request for funds is higher. They have donations as well for the project. It is a priority to convert every park to multi-sport, but they can't do that here as they are used by High School tennis teams and almost always in use for tennis teams. Explained this meets recreation space goals 1 and 2.

Q. Don Walters referred to a few years ago where there was an approval for tennis courts to bring them up to standards for Newburyport High School. Questioned that these are also for the HS and how many courts are reserved or needed? Also, if one of the courts could be made multi-purpose.

A. Kim Turner advised that 4 courts are needed for tournaments and there are only 3 there now. Making one multi-purpose would have to go through the School Department and Parks Commission.

VC Jane Healey added her son is on the tennis team and it is very tight at the Commons. The courts are shared with Triton so these are necessary for the sport and needed for both the boys' and girls' teams.

Q. Jamie Gagnon advised he talked to the girl's tennis coach and was told they can't host at Atkinson Commons as they need 4 courts in the same place. Is there an opportunity to build another court at Atkinson Commons to allow us to host?

A. Kim Turner explained there was a proposal a few years ago with private funding at lower Atkinson which is still in progress to build a multi-sport court. Confirmed 4 courts needed to host a tournament. At this time, they round robin which takes longer for the tournaments. Intent that once the lower court is built then can host.

Q. Jamie Gagnon asked if they can add to the current area?

A. Kim Turner advised expanding in that area would involve removing historic trees. She referred to Matt Ellsworth to further explain.



A. Matt Ellsworth, liaison to the Parks Commission, explained adding a court is unfavorable due to massive trees at upper left and it's very shaded which adds to deterioration of the court. Believe it would be met with a lot of resistance to build in that area. Currently kids are there late to complete matches and that is an issue.

Q. VC Jane Healey questioned the application for the Knock tennis courts project which included the design for 3 additional courts in that area for a total of 5 and if there were any plans to construct that court?

A. Kim Turner explained she was unsure, vaguely recalls that would have involved the courts to be rotated 90 degrees and that wasn't favorable, but unsure as she wasn't involved in that project.

Q. Jamie Gagnon asked when they would see the proposal for lower Atkinson courts?

A. Kim Turner responded that is with the lower Atkinson bigger project which moves the playground and parking. Can share that with the committee.

A. Chair Mike Dissette added that as part of the larger plan the CPC did recommend funding to move the playground as the first phase was approved. That needs to be completed first before the other pieces.

Chair Mike Dissette called for questions from Public- none.

h) Woodman Park Accessibility Project

City of Newburyport Parks Commission & Department \$57,570

Mike Hennessey Parks Manager reviewed Park location and history. This is one of very few recreation areas on the West End of the city. Project will make universal access to the playground area. Reviewed the current state of the area with deterioration of the timber stairs for access, it is not handicap accessible or environmentally friendly, and the walkway on left has outlived its usefulness with the edging popping up. He explained this project will add an accessible ramp which is Capital improvement to meet ADA requirements and no trees will be affected or damaged to do this work. The scope of work will include removing the rotten steps and the plastic. The new ramp will be a switchback. They will utilize stabilized stone dust, a new material to the landscape industry, which is as hard as concrete, but very hard and permeable. A riprap wall will be put where the steps were and they will replace the edging and put in a loam that is an ADA compliant wood fiber. They also plan to move the memorial pavers to the entrance of the ramp to recognize those who donated in the past. Public benefit as this is a very wooden site and popular in summer to get out of the sun, it's the only park in the west end of the city, it's very popular in the neighborhood with residents on top of the committee to make sure the park stays maintained, and is used by residents, dog walkers, and sporting teams. Project falls under the Recreation and Open Space plan with the main focus of improved access and ADA compliant, and a Capital improvement. He added it is a high priority of the Parks Department to improve accessibility in the parks.

Q. Chair Mike Dissette asked for the source of budget numbers?

A. Mike Hennessey explained he was a landscape contractor; he designed the project from start to finish and plugged numbers into modern day contractor costs associated with that.

Chair Mike Dissette called for questions from Public- none.

i) Atkinson Common Rock Tower Restoration  
City of Newburyport Parks Commission & Department \$59,950

Matt Ellsworth of the Parks Commission provided history of the Tower at the Atkinson Commons. A heavy timber observation tower was built on the north side of the park and fell into disrepair. In the 1930s as part of Roosevelt's WPA Act the tower was constructed and completed in 1936 as an observation tower for \$40,000. The tower is located by the tennis courts. As an architect he got involved with this project about 4 years ago. Explained this is a very attractive site that draws a lot of people but it has been closed in disrepair for 30 years. The steel stairs are rotted and they have been unable to make an assessment due to the condition of the tower. There was a generous donation made that allowed them to do some work and to assess the situation. The biggest concern is with the stones at the base of the tower that have popped and fallen out. Earlier work included repointing masonry and replacing the base stones at the base to solidify them, and also hired a contractor to demolish and remove steel stairs that remain. Resulted in a new temporary access stairs made of pressure treated wood and access to each level and the roof. He added they have tried to raise additional funds. There is a lot of staining and leaching of solids in the border and stone. Another issue is the tower's exposure to elements through the windows causing drains to clog on each level and slabs to spall and deteriorate. They are looking to provide epoxy coating to preserve the slabs for years to come and a slight slope in the drains to discharge the water. Preserving this portion of the tower will allow the additional phases of work to be done and prevent further deterioration so the tower can be reopened to the public in the future. Wilson Welding has provided services and they have received a separate grant for recoating steel bars on the windows. Explained there are 5 phases or work remaining with the 1st phase to repair concrete and coat with the epoxy sealer. Further steps include closing the roof, new permanent stair to code and railing system, clean and repoint upper exterior, sand blast, repaint, and rebuild basement bulkhead. The request for \$59,950 for phase 1 epoxy treatment which may start as early as spring.

Chair Mike Dissette called for questions from Committee or Public- none.

j) Downtown Lighting Project  
Department of Public Services *Request to be amended* \$69,377

Kim Turner advised originally the Mayor's office requested funding to replace toppers of approximately 265 post lights downtown. Initially it was thought it would fall under the Historic Preservation category but found only if each light was individually removed, rewired, reglazed, wired, repaired which is not possible for money, labor, and time standpoint. They are hoping CPC will consider as an adjustment to look at the lights within the 3 downtown parks. She provided a history of the downtown historic area and referred to the slide showing a picture of the street lights to replace. They are proposing replacing toppers of lights to Patrick Tracey Square, Inn St, and Market Square Park

under the Recreation category. She concluded that many of the lights are broken or malfunctioning as they were installed in the 1980's. The replacements will provide significant improvements as the current lights have wire baskets around them with 4 thin prongs and improve the downtown area with Public benefit of accessibility to open space and safe passage in the area. The new topper is sturdier and installed with LED fixtures. Requesting \$69,377 to replace 31 light toppers.

Q. Don Walters questioned how many total lights with the amendment and the cost difference from the original proposal, why is the cost similar?

A. Kim Turner advised a total of 31 opposed to 265 from the original request. She explained the original lights they considered were much lower cost and when they received a sample it did not meet expectations. The amended version has new lights with a much better quality and they have been used recently near Water, Market, and Summer Street with higher quality LEDs with historic character.

Q. Don Walters suggested they talk to Molly and Mass Save which may have incentives or rebates.

A. Kim Turner agreed and advised Molly has been very engaged in this and they are looking to see if this will qualify for rebates. She explained that the LEDs will have a lens or baffle to avoid hot spots and it makes it more sustainable light, and once that is applied it negates them from some of the rebates. Molly can provide more details on that.

Q. Mike asked how many of the 31 lamps are not working?

A. Kim Turner advised she was unsure but he would get that info from the City Electrician and provide it to Katelyn Sullivan.

Q. Joe Morgan questioned if anyone has done a payback analysis on the energy saved?

A. Kim Turner advised she would ask Molly and provide it to the Committee.

Chair Mike Dissette called for any other comments from Committee or Public - none.

**3. Other Business from Chair or Planning Director**

Chair Mike Dissette advised no other business from his side and confirmed with Katelyn Sullivan none from Planning.

**4. Approval of the 2/2/23 minutes**

Chair Mike Dissette motioned to approve the minutes from 2/2/23. Vice Chair Jane Healy moved with Chuck Griffin to second.

Roll call conducted with all in favor, with the exception of Don Walters, who abstained as he was not in attendance.

**5. Confirm next CPC meeting date**

Chair Mike Dissette advised the next meeting will be held via zoom on 3/2/23 at 7pm for deliberations and any additional information applicants should provide.

**6. Meeting adjournment**

Chair Mike Dissette moved to adjourn. Chuck Griffin moved with Joe Teixeira 2<sup>nd</sup> .  
Roll call taken with all in favor to adjourn at 9:07pm.