



Bylaws Committee Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date: May 2, 2023 Location: ZOOM

Bylaw Committee Members present: Jonathan Meindersma, Andrew Feland, Barur “Raj” Rajeshkumar, David Femia,

Members Absent: David Mercurio and Sarah Miles

Meeting was opened by the Chair of the Bylaws Committee, Jon Meindersma at 7:04 pm. Roll Call vote: All members in favor.

The Members discussed the upcoming Semi-Annual Town Meeting warrant articles.

Article 4: Dave F made the motion to recommend, Andrew seconded. Roll call Vote: All members in favor. No discussion.

Article 11: Dave F made the motion to recommend, Andrew seconded. Roll call Vote: All members in favor. No discussion.

Article 12: Dave F made the motion to recommend, Andrew seconded. Roll call Vote: All members in favor. No discussion.

Article 17: Dave F made the motion to recommend, Andrew seconded. Roll call Vote: All members in favor. No discussion.

Article 18: David Femia made a motion to recommend, Andrew F. seconded. Jon asked if any of the members knew what the reason for the policy change was. No members had clarification on what the article was trying to accomplish after discussing what the current Bylaw states. Dave. F. withdrew his motion. Andrew seconded the withdrawal It was decided that the Committee needs more

information in order to form an opinion. Andrew made a motion to take no action. Dave F seconded. Roll call Vote: All members in favor.

Article 19: Andrew made a motion to recommend, Dave F. seconded. All in favor. Jon explained the meaning of the article and what it was trying to accomplish. He stated that “it lets us get someone with experience”. Andrew stated “this article is what makes or breaks a deal”. Jon agreed, he stated, “that this makes us competitive for new hires.”

Article 20: Andrew made a motion to recommend, Dave F. seconded. Roll call Vote: All members in favor. David F. offered clarification on the purpose of this article. It was explained that the article was a correction to a previous Town meeting acceptance.

Article 21: Dave made a motion to recommend, Andrew seconded. It was then discussed that there are still a few issues with the new Disability Commission Bylaw. Dave then withdrew his motion; Andrew seconded the withdrawal. Dave then made another motion to take no action on this article. Andrew seconded the motion. Jon expressed as the Committee that helped create this Bylaw with the Disability Commission, we should discuss that before we take no action. Dave and Andrew agreed to discuss. After discussion on the edits that Jon wanted to make, Jon made a motion to recommend with the edits to section 5:2-to require a 6-member board to have a quorum of 4 and section 5:4- Replace Chairperson or “any other three members shall have the power to call a special meeting” and change to “Chairperson or, at least 3 members acting together are required to call a special meeting. Andrew seconded. Roll Call Vote: Jon-Yes, Raj-Yes, Andrew-Yes, Dave F-No

Article 22: Dave F made the motion to recommend, Andrew seconded. Raj explained that the State Law reads 2 years for a property to be abandoned. The Town Bylaw says 1 year, so the Planning Board submitted this article to match State Law. Then Town Council made an edit and changed it to “Two or more” Roll Call Vote: All members in favor.

Article 23: Dave F made the motion to recommend, Andrew and Raj both seconded. Jon explained the meaning of the article. He stated that basically the meaning behind it if there is a property line divided by district boundaries you cannot take advantage of less restricted district. The current Bylaw states you can extend up to 30 feet. The proposed Bylaw states you can’t extend at all. Jon asked if there was any more discussion. Hearing none, Jon called for a roll call vote. Roll Call: Jon-no, Raj-yes, Andrew-yes, Dave F. yes

Article 24: Dave F made the motion to recommend, Raj seconded. Raj explained that this article just eliminates old copies, and replaces it with current. Roll call vote: All members voted in favor.

Article 25: Dave F made the motion to recommend, Raj seconded. Dave asked Raj if this article has anything to do with MS4. Raj responded it is two separate things. He stated MS4 covers our sewer systems and drainage. Raj explained this proposed Zoning Bylaw makes it more standard and more current with State Law. Roll Call vote: All members voted in favor.

Article 26: Jon asked for discussion. He wanted to know what the current Bylaw reads. Raj explained that this proposed Bylaw is meant to clarify the definition of “Habitable Buildings per Lot” Andrew further explained what he thought the meaning was, which was he thought that the it was to make it more clear on what one building meant. Dave F disagreed and then gave an example property in Town. Raj corrected Dave and told Dave he believes he is talking about the wrong property. Raj continued to give more specific examples. Dave disagrees with this proposed Bylaw. There was a lengthy discussion between members about the definition of what one building per lot means. Andrew made a motion to recommend, Raj. seconded. Roll call: Jon-no, Dave no, Andrew-yes, Raj-yes Jon explained that this vote is not a consensus to recommend, so the Committee has no collective opinion to recommend to the public body.

Article 27: Jon asked if any members know anything about the purpose of this article. Raj gave an example of a property in town that built a huge garage in a residential zone. Raj explained the example he gave has been in housing court with the Zoning Board of Appeals and the Homeowner. This article is meant to avoid this from happening again by adding this proposed Zoning Bylaw. The second part of the article is in regards to conex boxes. Dave F. stated he thinks it’s wrong to put this portion of the Bylaw in because he feels that it should say it is permissible in all districts upon on requiring a building permit from the Building Inspector. Jon asked for more explanation. Andrew explained that the article is restrictive to residential properties for temporary use. Dave and Andrew stated they think a permit should have to be applied for through the Building Inspector Dave F. recommended that the Bylaw be written with the stipulation that the permit issued for a Conex Box is only good for 60 days. Jon raised the point that, with the time frame it can be an issue to monitor. Jon made the suggestion that the permit is only good for 60 days, and then there will be a requirement to extend the permit. Jon made the comment he thinks this article needs a lot more work. Dave stated he has a problem with the whole Bylaw, and thinks it should be sent back to

the Planning Board for more clarification. Dave made a motion not to recommend, Andrew seconded. Jon stated that this Committee should clarify to the Planning Board the reason the Bylaw Committee feels they should not recommend. Jon and Andrew both stated they feel the article is just not ready, and feels it may cause more resistance without better clarification. Roll Call-Jon-yes, Andrew-yes, Dave F.-yes, Raj-No

Jon recommends that the Planning Board is made aware that the Bylaw Committee will not be recommending this Bylaw and the reason why. Jon said he will reach out to Vinny and explain.

Dave made a motion to adjourn. Andrew seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned 9:06 pm

Respectfully Submitted,

Daymian Bartek, Town Clerk