

HOPKINTON PLANNING BOARD

Monday, July 28, 2003 7:00 PM

MINUTES

PRESENT: John H. Coolidge, Chairman, Jaime Goncalves, Vice Chairman, Mark Abate, Scott Aghababian, Sandy K. Altamura, Pamela Duffy, Tina Rose, Claire Wright
.....Elaine C. Lazarus, Planning Director

1. 38 School Street

Ron Roux, Hallmark Properties, Inc., appeared before the Board. He described the parcel at 38 School St., currently owned by DiCarlo. He noted that he may purchase the parcel with frontage on Elizabeth Rd. and West Elm St. and he is thinking of ways to develop the property. He stated the parcel would be 17 acres. He showed the Board a possible conventional subdivision plan with 10 lots, an OSLPD plan with 7 lots, an ANR (81-P) plan with 5 lots with three acres each, and his preferred plan, 5 lots on a private road off Elizabeth Rd. He stated he wants to create a little neighborhood with a private road, which would be narrow and have pavers at the shoulders and corners to increase turning radius but not pavement width. He stated that he would do either the ANR plan or the preferred private road plan. He noted that several waivers and/or variances would be necessary to construct the preferred plan.

Ms. Altamura asked why the waivers would be justified, and why the ANR plan wouldn't be preferred. She cited concerns about the Board setting a precedent.

Mr. Aghababian arrived at this time.

Mr. Goncalves asked what the benefit to the Town is of the preferred plan. Ms. Altamura noted it would have the same number of houses as the ANR plan. Ms. Wright noted that it would keep the frontage along West Elm St. wooded as it is now, adding it could be beneficial to have that rather than the fronts of houses facing the street.

Mr. Roux stated that his preferred plan is a progressive approach to development. He noted that the road would be private and no Town services would be required for its maintenance. He stated he isn't sure if he can meet the price point with the ANR lots.

Ms. Rose stated as long as the conventional plan is proven to be viable, she has no problem with it.

Mr. Abate expressed concern with the tight corners proposed on the private road. Mr. Coolidge noted he has safety concerns, and also expressed concern with establishing private estates. Ms. Altamura asked if it would send the message to the development community that the Board doesn't want OSLPD plans anymore, which wouldn't be true.

Mr. Roux stated he likes the OSLPD bylaw that he helped to write and pass, and the idea of requiring submission of OSLPD plans before a conventional plan can be approved is still a good idea. He stated that specific properties sometimes need to be looked at on a case by case basis, and he wouldn't do an OSLPD plan on this property, he would do the ANR lots.

Mr. Goncalves asked if he had discussed the preferred plan with the Police Dept. or Fire Dept. He stated that he understands the goal and likes the conceptual look, but needs to consider the safety aspect. He stated he is concerned with snow conditions. He stated that the owners will plow it, it is their safety at issue, and hopes they will understand that.

Ms. Altamura stated she is concerned with developers attorneys throwing past actions in the Board's face. She stated that if an OSLPD plan is denied to allow this plan to go forward, it could be a problem. Mr. Roux stated if the plan isn't approved, he won't exercise his option to purchase. He stated that the number of lots would be reduced from the OSLPD or conventional subdivision plans possible for the property.

Mr. Abate stated he likes the plan. Ms. Wright noted that it preserves the look of the neighborhood and is superior to the curb cuts and houses on the existing roads that the ANR plan shows. Mr. Aghababian asked why there is so much concern about dead end streets in Hopkinton. Mr. Coolidge noted the Town has a long history of not liking dead end streets, and it is mostly related to safety issues.

Mr. Roux noted that the Board should use South Barn Rd. as a model for this plan, although South Barn is a public way. He stated that he would have 14 ft. of pavement and pavers adjacent to that for an additional 2 feet. He stated that it would be like South Barn except there would be no open space. Ms. Wright asked if the circle could be larger to avoid a tight radius. Mr. Roux stated he wants to keep it narrow so it will look like a small road. Ms. Altamura stated she likes the pavers. Mr. Goncalves asked if there could be any open space created. Mr. Roux noted that the density would increase if there was. Ms. Duffy asked if the houses would be of similar scale to the ones nearby. Mr. Roux stated they would be bigger, from 6,000 to 7,000 sq. ft. Ms. Duffy cited concerns with precedent. Mr. Coolidge noted that it seems as though the Board's concerns and problems could be resolved.

2. Cranberry Cove

Robert Clark, developer, appeared before the Board. Mr. Coolidge explained that Mr. Clark is requesting a waiver of curbing type, and he had met on the site with Mr. Clark and J. T. Gaucher, DPW Director, in this regard. Mr. Clark stated he wants to replace the cape cod berm with a monolithic top coat with a berm that is formed during the paving process. He stated that he has compared the cape cod berm with monolithic berm in other locations, and it holds up better over time. He stated that when a snow plow hits a cape cod berm, it can move, but the monolithic berm is one piece and plows ride up on it better. He stated he would rather have this throughout the subdivision, in place of the cape cod berm, granite guttermouths at catch basins, and the granite radius at Pond St. He stated it would be more consistent with the area, as no granite curb was used on other subdivisions off Pond St. He stated he wants to finish all work by Oct. 15, including replacement of the curb.

Ms. Duffy asked how the DPW feels about it. Mr. Clark stated he met with the DPW Director and he would prefer sloped granite throughout the subdivision, which is about the same amount of money. He stated he thinks the Town should go with the monolithic berm instead of cape cod berm in new subdivisions. He stated that it was used in Forestside I and there are no breaks in the berm, unlike the old part of Wescott Dr. which has broken up.

Mr. Coolidge noted that Mr. Gaucher had an issue with switching between cape cod berm and granite guttermouths at the catch basins, as the plows hit the edges. He stated that in general, he would rather see all granite. Ms. Wright stated that DiCarlo Rd. looks nice with the monolithic berm. She noted that where there is granite curbing, there is a tendency for weeds to grow between the cracks and monolithic would result in a neater look.

Mary Pratt, 102 Fruit St., asked if it is ADA compliant.

Mr. Coolidge noted that the required breaks and ramps in the sidewalk would still be provided.

The Board voted unanimously to waive the cape cod berm and granite guttermouths in the Cranberry Cove subdivision in favor of the monolithic berm.

3. Oakdale Estates

John Thomas and Daniel Feeney, Beals & Thomas, Inc., appeared before the Board. Mr. Feeney requested release of the lots in the Oakdale Estates subdivision and the establishment of a performance guarantee amount. He stated that a few items remain, consisting of replacement of the culvert under West Elm St. and the pavement thickness of 3 ½ inches instead of 4 inches as required. He noted that Dave Glenn, the Board's inspecting engineer, had reviewed and recommended an estimate to complete the work. Mr. Feeney requested that the Board only release lot 4 in lieu of providing a performance guarantee. He stated they would put a one inch overlay on the road and address the culvert issue. Mr. Coolidge asked about the status of DPW approval of the culvert replacement. Mr. Feeney stated they had spoken to Mr. Gaucher and he has verbally approved the design but no formal review has been issued.

Mr. Abate asked if the road is used to access lot 4, and Mr. Feeney replied yes. Ms. Rose stated she has a problem with releasing a lot on a road that is used to access the lot without a bond. Ms. Lazarus stated that holding back on the release of lots is of no benefit to the Town if it needs to complete the work, and is not one of the forms of performance guarantee listed in MGL c.41.

It was noted that some abutters had complained about use of Winter St. for construction equipment access. Ms. Rose questioned the use of Winter St. Ms. Wright asked if that would end at some time. Mr. Thomas stated that access from Country Way requires some blasting, and Winter St. is more readily useable. He stated that Country Way could be used later.

The Board reviewed the performance guarantee estimate. The Board voted unanimously to establish a performance guarantee amount of \$21,600.00. It was moved to release lots 1, 2, 3, and 4 on Country Way upon receipt of the amount. Mr. Thomas stated there is a lot of activity on the site now, with 25 people working there. He stated that the home site is closer to Winter

St. than Country Way. The Board voted unanimously to release the four lots upon receipt of the performance guarantee amount.

4. 81-P Plan – 45 Granite St. – Milford Water Company

Joe Marquedant, Jr., surveyor, and Arthur Arbetter, applicant, appeared before the Board. Mr. Marquedant described the plan to divide the parcel into two lots. He noted that an OSLPD special permit had been issued for the property in 2000 (Echo Lake Estates) allowing 10 lots. He stated that after the special permit was issued, the Milford Water Co. (MWC) took the land by eminent domain and the matter was litigated. He stated that the plan represents a negotiated settlement. He stated that the MWC will retain a 17 acre parcel and Mr. Arbetter will receive lot 1, which will be a house lot. Mr. Arbetter stated that the Conservation Commission has approved the proposed development of the lot. Mr. Coolidge asked if the MWC has approved this plan and if there is a court decision issued or if it was negotiated. Mr. Arbetter stated they are before the Board with the blessing of the MWC, and Mr. Marquedant stated that the MWC is in agreement with the plan.

Ms. Wright asked what would happen to the old house on the property, noting that the Town’s Historic Preservation bylaw would apply if it was to be demolished.

The Board voted unanimously to endorse the plan as not requiring approval under the subdivision control law.

5. 81-P Plan – 82 East Main St. – Mezitt

Mr. Marquedant described the 9 acre parcel currently owned by Wayne Mezitt on East Main St. across from Frankland Rd., containing one house. He stated the plan represents some estate planning, with portions being gifted to the children. Ms. Duffy asked if there is street access to the back land, and Mr. Marquedant replied no. Mr. Coolidge noted that the land is used as part of Weston Nurseries. Mr. Goncalves asked about the old railroad bed comprising one parcel, and Mr. Marquedant noted that it had been abandoned several years ago.

The Board voted unanimously to endorse the plan as not requiring approval under the subdivision control law.

6. 81-P Plan – School St. – Comery

Bruce Kinsman, surveyor, described the plan to divide the 27 acre parcel into 3 conforming lots for conveyance purposes. He stated that the owner wants it in this form for conveyance. It was noted that the parcel is the subject of an approved comprehensive permit for Peppercorn Village. The Board voted unanimously to endorse the plan as not requiring approval under the subdivision control law.

7. Springwood West

Ron Nation, developer, appeared before the Board. He noted that he had reviewed a copy of the performance guarantee amount recommended and questioned additional amounts added. Ms. Lazarus noted that the Board’s engineer had inadvertently left out an amount for loam and seed, and the Board is now automatically adding an item for “administrative, legal, engineering costs”

in the event that it needs to pull the bond, and that item is estimated to be \$5,000 for this subdivision.

Ms. Duffy asked if the Open Space Preservation Commission would be mowing the fields in the open space, noting that she thought it was to be wildflowers. Mr. Coolidge stated that it would be mowed once a year.

The Board voted unanimously to establish the performance guarantee amount for Oak Street in the Springwood West subdivision, and a small portion in Springwood III, at \$34,980.00. The Board voted unanimously to release lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 in Springwood West and lot 53 in Springwood III upon receipt of the performance guarantee amount.

8. Public Hearing – Padik View – Definitive Subdivision Plan – Wood St. - Westboro-Hopkinton Street Trust (Harvey)

James Hanrahan, attorney, and Jerry Cushing, engineer, appeared before the Board. Mr. Hanrahan noted that they had sent a letter to the Board today requesting that the hearing be continued to August 25 so they can address the comments made by Fay, Spofford & Thorndike (FST), the Board's engineer. He stated they will also agree to extend the time for the Board to file its decision to August 29. He stated they will answer questions and address issues for the next hearing. Mr. Coolidge asked if they agree with the recommendations and comments made by FST or if there are things to work out. Mr. Hanrahan stated it is a matter of adding things to the plan and addressing their comments.

Ms. Rose noted that the waivers that are required need to be addressed. Mr. Hanrahan stated they will address the waiver issue so that none will be needed.

Stephen Scaringi, 81 Hopkinton Rd., Westborough, asked where the water supply for the lots is on the plan.

Mr. Coolidge stated that the plan shows a water line from the Town of Westborough. He noted that the Board will need a letter from the Town of Westborough stating that they have approved the provision of water. Mr. Hanrahan stated that one of the difficulties of not knowing the future uses of the lot is that they don't know what the water usage will be. He stated that the Board can condition its approval on no buildings being built until water is provided. He stated that their water needs are not known, and it isn't the intention of the applicant to build this plan, but the Board can add appropriate conditions. Mr. Coolidge stated that the Board is very concerned with water supply, adding that the Town does not extend water mains at this time. He stated the applicant will need a letter from the DPW regarding future water use.

Mr. Scaringi stated there is no approval of the Town of Westborough for water use. He stated that one of the lots is over the capped landfill. He stated he is concerned with the re-use of this area, and asked what requirements there could be.

Mr. Cushing stated there is sufficient land on the lot to locate a building without being on the landfill. He stated that in order to build on the landfill they would need DEP approval.

Mr. Goncalves stated that would be very difficult. He stated that the most extensive thing DEP would allow on a landfill is a golf course. He asked about compliance with DEP regulations relative to monitoring, scheduling, etc. Mr. Cushing described the monitoring and report to be done, and new monitoring wells. Mr. Goncalves asked if the monitoring wells will be on the property, and Mr. Cushing replied yes. Ms. Duffy asked if the wells will be shown on the plan, and Mr. Cushing replied yes.

Mrs. Pratt stated there is no water from Hopkinton at this location.

John Craycroft, Westborough, questioned whether the Piccadilly Mill Trust had been notified of the public hearing. Ms. Lazarus reviewed the file and noted that it was. Mr. Craycroft stated that the address where the notice was sent was incorrect, since it was changed from the developer to the Trust. Ms. Lazarus noted that the list was provided by the Board of Assessors office in Westborough, and if there are changes, he should follow up with them.

Muriel Kramer, 39 North St., asked if there are wells in the ACEC. Mr. Cushing stated the wells were put in over the last two weeks and testing will start the beginning of next week. He stated that his firm, Brown & Caldwell, will do the testing.

Ms. Duffy asked if they built the subdivision plan would they still propose the recycling facility on the property. Mr. Hanrahan stated they couldn't do both. Mr. Coolidge noted that each proposal needs to stand on its own merits.

The Board voted unanimously to continue the public hearing to August 25, 2003 at 8:00 PM and to extend the date by which a decision must be filed to August 29, 2003.

9. 81-P Plan – 24 Huckleberry Road – Oak Hill Construction Co.

Jack Bartolini, applicant, described the plan to modify lot lines to accommodate a well radius. It was noted that there would be no change to the frontage of each lot, which would continue to conform to zoning requirements. The Board voted unanimously to endorse the plan as not requiring approval under the subdivision control law.

10. Administrative Business

The Board voted unanimously to pay outstanding bills.

Design Review Board Appointments:

It was noted that one of the Alternate positions will be vacant. Ms. Wright stated that Nancy Stevenson, Hayden Rowe St., had expressed interest in being on the Board, and that she has a Masters degree in design. The Board voted unanimously to re-appoint Claire Wright, Sue-Ellen Stoddard, Jeffrey Doherty, Jeanette Thomson, and Beth Kelly as full members, and Gail Fallon as an alternate member. The Board noted that Ms. Stevenson should send in a letter for the next meeting. Ms. Wright stated that the Design Review Board appreciates the support of the Planning Board, which gives the advisory group some teeth.

Zoning Advisory Committee Appointments:

Mr. Coolidge noted that the Committee could have 11 members given the interest expressed, and that it might be too big. He suggested only 1 member from the ZBA and Con. Comm. instead. He stated he wants ideas from the ZAC, and doesn't want to waste time on things that won't pass at Town Meeting. The Board discussed the matter, and decided to appoint all those who were interested, noting that the number of attendees is usually less than the full membership. It was noted that the Board had already appointed the four Planning Board members to the Committee at a previous meeting. The Board voted unanimously to appoint the following for one year:

- Ross Ginsberg and Wayne Davies – Zoning Board of Appeals
- Michael Carmody and Brian Morrison – Conservation Commission
- Ron Roux – Chamber of Commerce
- David Goldman – Citizen at large
- Michael Shepard – Director of Municipal Inspections

The Board set the first meeting date for the ZAC on August 27, 2003 at 7:30 PM.

11. 176 Spring Street

Richard Braden, 176 Spring St., stated that he owns 13 acres and his neighbor has 21 acres. He stated he is interested in developing his parcel, and has had some interest from developers but the topography is steep and he isn't really interested in developing the whole area. He stated that he would like to create one additional lot on his parcel, and has an agreement to purchase some land from his neighbor. He stated he would like to have an OSLPD plan and there would be about 7 acres of open space created for the Town, and two lots with 100 ft. of frontage on Spring St., one of which would contain his existing house. He stated there is a potential connection to the Upton State Forest through abutting property which that owner intends to develop at some point. He stated there are ways the property can be developed and reviewed a possible loop road, noting the engineering would be expensive. He stated that he proposes an OSLPD plan with no road.

Ms. Rose asked if a conventional plan is possible. The Board discussed the options with Mr. Braden. Ms. Lazarus noted that the abutter has spoken to her twice and expressed an interest in developing the parcel, and a conventional plan layout could take that into account if they could be developed together.

Mr. Braden stated that the land is unique, with large trees and steep topography. He stated there are stone cisterns on the property and he doesn't know what they were for, and there is an old foundation at Spring St. that might have been a blacksmith shop given the debris found in the area.

Mr. Coolidge stated he would rather see a common driveway to the two lots instead of two driveways. Ms. Altamura stated it sounds like a parcel worth preserving. Ms. Rose and Mr. Goncalves expressed an interest in walking the property. Mr. Coolidge stated that if a conventional plan is viable, he would be in favor of another lot with a common driveway. Ms. Rose stated she would want documentation on the uniqueness of the property, and would have a problem if the plan would make undevelopable land developable. Mr. Braden stated if he doesn't do a plan like this, the land will be sold.

The Board decided to walk the property in September with a member of the Historical Commission if possible. The Board recommended that Mr. Braden contact a member of the Commission to see if they have any information on the former use of the property and the stone structures.

Mrs. Pratt suggested creating an extra lot to donate to the Hopkinton Area Land Trust for a tax advantage.

12. Public Hearing – Hopkinton Highlands III – Garden Apartment Site Plan - Overlook Rd.

Benjamin Smith, engineer, appeared before the Board. He stated there would be 26 townhouses, 2 ½ stories tall, on a 24 ft. wide driveway with two 12 ft. lanes on the boulevard portion. He stated that the original special permit called for a 1,150 ft. long cul-de-sac and a septic system on the south of the property accessed by a long gravel road. He stated that they have found suitable soils near the units so the system has been relocated. He stated the system would meet Title 5, and the units would drain down toward the cul-de-sac to a septic tank with a pump chamber, then flow to a dosing chamber, then it would be pumped back up to the leach field. He addressed water supply, noting the proposed location of the well is behind the first and second cluster of units. He stated they will have to drill the hole and test, etc. He stated there would be a cistern for fire protection in the location shown on the plan. He described the drainage system, stating it will ensure there will be no post-development increase in runoff. He stated there would be two underground systems for recharge. He stated they feel they can address the concerns raised by FST and others, noting they had also received comments from Ms. Lazarus. He addressed FST's comments, noting the area is not within an Interim Wellhead Protection Area (IWPA) which is on the adjacent parcel, 60 ft. to the north. He stated that the traffic issues raised will be easy to address.

Mr. Coolidge asked about the lot to be donated to the Hopkinton Area Land Trust (HALT). Mr. Smith showed the location of the parcel, noting that the boundaries would be adjusted to go around the well radius, so that is on the condominium parcel. Mr. Goncalves asked which well the IWPA is for, and Mr. Smith stated he thinks it is for The Preserve condominium.

Ms. Duffy asked about the location of the recreation area required in the bylaw. Mr. Smith stated there would be a playground and a separate play area with gazebo across the driveway. Ms. Lazarus stated that the bylaw requires that the designated recreation area be for active recreation. Mr. Smith stated he would address that.

A question was asked about the length of the proposed road. Mr. Smith stated it would be 1,650 ft. He stated the Conservation Commission didn't like the shorter road and asked that it be extended. He stated the developer intends to donate 35 acres of open space. He addressed the line of sight from Hopkinton Reservoir, showing a profile that assumes no vegetation. He stated that topography will block view of the units. Ms. Altamura stated she is also concerned about visibility from Rt. 85. Mr. Smith stated that nothing will be seen.

Ms. Altamura asked about lighting. Mr. Smith stated the plan shows street lights, but would abide by restrictions imposed by the Board. Ms. Altamura stated she doesn't want any street

Hopkinton Planning Board – Minutes, July 28, 2003

lights. She stated she has a problem with the length of the road, and it exceeds 1,000 ft., which is the maximum allowed in subdivisions, and 1,150 ft. which was approved in the special permit for this project. She stated the length proposed is too much, and they should chop off the end and go back to 1,150 ft.

Mr. Smith stated the project can be built all clustered at the front end, or spread out to fit better with the environment. He stated the Conservation Commission is pleased with the revisions and it is less dense. He stated he is aware they need a waiver, but they think there are aesthetic benefits and greenspace benefits. He stated the boulevard entrance is to allow for better/safer access to the property.

Mr. Abate stated he is very concerned with the septic system. He asked if it had been discussed with the Board of Health. Mr. Smith stated they have commented favorably on it. He stated there will be a generator in case of power outage. He stated the alternative is a septic tank in front of each unit and the system will be required to be run by a licensed operator. Mr. Aghababian stated he is concerned about the septic system and the length of the road.

Mr. Goncalves asked if there is an alternative location for the well in case the one selected doesn't work out. Mr. Smith replied yes. Mr. Goncalves stated he is concerned with the length of the road, and this is a big problem. Mr. Smith asked if the concerns are related to safety. Ms. Altamura asked how many units are at the end section of the road, and Mr. Smith replied 11. Ms. Altamura stated that they should be eliminated and the road shouldn't exceed 1,000 ft.

Mrs. Pratt asked if the well location will be downstream of the septic system leach field, and Mr. Smith replied no. He added that there are many well siting options, but they would have to cross wetlands to the alternative locations. Ms. Altamura stated the plan may be more environmentally sensitive than the original one, but it is too dense for the site. She stated that the end of the cul-de-sac should be eliminated. Mr. Smith asked if the Board would consider a safety analysis prepared by a consultant on that issue. Mr. Coolidge asked that they look at Town regulations and the original concept plan approved by the Board, and the issues raised then. He stated they are asking for a bigger waiver than granted before. Mr. Smith stated that they reduced the number of units and modified the plan in accordance with Conservation Commission requests to achieve good goals. He asked if a written endorsement from the Conservation Commission would be helpful.

Mr. Abate stated he is not in favor of the plan. He stated there are many negatives and no positives. Ms. Wright stated her concerns are public safety, health, and water quality. She stated there needs to be a balance. Mr. Smith stated that DEP, FST, and others will review the plans. He stated that public health will not be put in jeopardy if one thing goes wrong. Ms. Rose stated they need to address each of FST's comments, and other comments raised also.

Mrs. Pratt stated they should call David Goldman, President of HALT, as they may not want a well on the property.

The Board voted unanimously to continue the public hearing to August 11, 2003 at 9:00 PM.

13. Other Business

The Board reviewed draft goals and objectives for FY04 prepared by Ms. Lazarus. The Board voted unanimously to approve the following goals:

1. Work to implement the Housing Plan, due to be completed in September, 2003.
2. Begin work necessary to update the Master Plan in 2004.
3. Work toward a town-wide GIS system (a continuing goal).
4. Begin discussion and work on an ACEC for the Lake Whitehall and Whitehall Brook area.
5. Draft modifications to the Site Plan Review Submission Requirements and Procedures and/or Site Plan Review bylaw to require compliance with the DEP Stormwater Management Policy Handbook and Technical Handbook, as outlined in the Stormwater Management Plan for prepared the Town.
6. Work with legislators to reform the Zoning Act.
7. Work to reduce by 4% the FY04 budgeted expenses by cost reductions and efficiency improvements.
8. Recognize and reward employees who provide solutions for cost reductions and efficiency improvements.
9. Work with the Town to implement an efficient and standardized performance appraisal system.
10. Communicate and educate the public of the Planning Department's functions, activities and successes.

Community Preservation Committee Appointment:

The Board voted unanimously to appoint Ms. Duffy as its representative to the Community Preservation Committee for the next year.

The Board voted unanimously to approve the Minutes of June 2, 2003.

14. Deer Run

The Board reviewed a request from Gregory Herrema, 13 Fawn Ridge Rd., for grading of the back yard, a portion of which would be within the easement for the detention pond on the property. The Board reviewed the plan. The Board stated that the plan is acceptable as long as the functioning of the detention basin is not affected, and it does not appear from the plan that it will be. The Board also recommended that only biodegradable pesticides and herbicides be used in the area, and that use of fertilizers be limited to no- or low-phosphorus fertilizers.

The Board reviewed a request from HALT to allow the planting of the remaining street trees in the subdivision in the cul-de-sac island instead of along the road. The Board stated that this would be acceptable.

15. 14 Daniel Shays Rd.

The Board reviewed a request to allow the language contained in the deed for 14 Daniel Shays Rd., formerly 111 Saddle Hill Rd., relative to the relocation of the driveway from Saddle Hill Rd. to Daniel Shays Rd. The Board noted that the driveway had been relocated as required, and that the language can now be removed. The Board signed a document consenting to the removal of the language.

16. Hopkinton Highlands II

Ms. Lazarus referred to correspondence from Luckner Bayas, the Board's inspecting engineer on the Hopkinton Highlands II subdivision. She stated that test holes revealed material in Overlook Rd. that did not conform to Town specifications. Additional test holes requested by Toll Brothers, Inc. did not alter the results. She noted that she and Mr. Bayas had requested that the material be removed and replaced, but that the contractor wanted the Board to consider that they feel the road would be adequate with the material and it should be left alone. She noted that the contractor wanted the Board to come look at the material. The Board stated that the material should be removed and replaced, and that it did not need to look at it.

17. Other Business

Mr. Coolidge noted that the Board of Selectmen requested that a representative of the Planning Board attend its meeting on August 5, 2003 to discuss economic development and the status of the permitting process for the Harvey recycling facility on Wood St.

The Board set the following meeting dates: Sept. 15, Sept. 29, Oct. 20, Nov. 3, Nov. 17, Dec. 8, and Dec. 22.

Adjourned: 10:40 PM

Elaine C. Lazarus, Planning Director

Approved: August 25, 2003