

HOPKINTON PLANNING BOARD

Monday, October 20, 2003 7:30 PM

MINUTES

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

1. 81-P Plan – 79 Ash St. - Macchi

Joe Marquedant, Jr., surveyor, and Trina Macchi, owner, appeared before the Board. Mr. Marquedant described the plan to create a new building lot which fronts on Stone Crossing Way. He stated that the existing garage would be bisected by the new property line and it would be moved to be on the 79 Ash St. property. Mr. Herr asked where the house on the new lot would be located, and Mr. Marquedant stated it would probably be toward the back of the property. It was noted that the frontage requirements in the Residence B district were met by the new lot. The Board voted unanimously to endorse the subdivision plan as not requiring approval under the subdivision control law.

2. EMC Corp. – South St.

Paul Casey, EMC Corp., referred to the request submitted by EMC Corp. for the return of performance guarantee and 53G funds held for several building projects on South St. which have been completed. Mr. Coolidge noted that some of the shrubs which were required to be planted along South St. on the site plan for #80 appear to be missing. Ms. Duffy asked about a noise issue at 80 South St. related to the mechanical equipment in the back. Mr. Coolidge noted that a helicopter landing pad had been placed in the parking lot at #80, and asked that EMC determine if the number of parking spaces remaining complied with the Town's requirement.

It was moved and seconded to authorize the release of performance guarantee funds held for all projects with the exception of 80 South St. (52, 171, and 176 South St.).

Ms. Altamura asked who addresses helicopter landing issues, such as noise, and the Board should make sure it is in compliance. Ms. Duffy asked that the 80 South St. noise levels be addressed.

The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion. The Board voted unanimously to authorize the release of the remaining 53G account funds held for 52, 171, 176, and 228 South St.

3. Administrative Business

The Board voted unanimously to pay outstanding bills.

4. 81-P Plan – 2 Brook Hollow Ln. – Capital Group Properties

No one was present representing the applicant. Ms. Lazarus described the plan, which would modify the property line of 2 Brook Hollow Lane by separating off a parcel for conveyance to the Hopkinton Area Land Trust. The Board noted that frontage requirements would continue to be met. The Board voted unanimously to endorse the plan as not requiring approval under the subdivision control law.

5. Administrative Business

The Board voted 7 in favor with Ms. Duffy abstaining to approve the Minutes of September 15, 2003.

6. Next Generation Children’s Center – 2 Wood St.

The Board reviewed materials received from Town Counsel and Walker Realty relative to the Next Generation Children’s Center, which would be located at 2 Wood St., and which is the subject of pending litigation. The Board discussed Walker’s proposal to modify the draft conditions to state that the entrance could be within 40 ft. of the building’s southwesterly corner, changed from the provision stating that it would be located on the corner.

7. E. L. Harvey & Sons – Wood St.

James Hanrahan, attorney representing E. L. Harvey & Sons, and Jerry Cushing, engineer, appeared before the Board. Mr. Hanrahan stated that in anticipation of filing a Site Plan Review application, they wanted to give the Board an overview and go over the submittal requirements. He stated they have received Site Assignment from the Bd. of Health and are now before the Board of Appeals. He stated there is a little bit of “chicken and egg” with regard to the applications to the ZBA and the Planning Board. He stated they would like feedback from the Board. Mr. Coolidge asked if they expect the ZBA hearing to be closed at the next session, and Mr. Hanrahan replied no.

Mr. Cushing described the site and its location. He stated they propose to use the site to process 600 tons/day of recyclable materials. He stated that vehicles will bring the materials in and offload in the Materials Recovery and Recycling Facility (MRRF) building. He stated that construction and demolition (C&D) debris would be brought to the C&D building. He described the traffic patterns proposed for the site.

Ms. Altamura asked about the number of trucks that can back up to the MRRF building at one time. Mr. Cushing stated he didn’t know, but that several can. He stated there will be designated areas in the building where material will be dumped. Ms. Altamura stated there shouldn’t be any trucks backed up on Wood St. Mr. Hanrahan stated that the traffic studies will address that.

Ms. Wright asked if the entrance and exit onto Wood St. would be the same, and Mr. Cushing replied yes. Ms. Duffy asked if trucks leave empty, and Mr. Cushing replied yes. He stated that other, larger vehicles pick up the sorted materials. He noted that there would be 7-ton trucks bringing materials in and 20 to 22 ton trucks leaving. Mr. Coolidge asked if that would be a daily process, and Mr. Cushing replied yes. Ms. Altamura asked about the hours of operation. Mr. Cushing stated receiving would be done from 6:30 AM to 4:30 PM, and processing would occur until 7:00 PM. Ms. Altamura asked when the traffic to and from the site stops. Mr. Hanrahan stated that employees leave after 4:30 PM and that no trucks would leave after 4:30.

Mr. Herr asked if everything brought into the site gets recycled/reused. He asked what happens to the other materials. Mr. Cushing stated that there could be things that are separated out that aren't recycled, and they go to a landfill or incinerator. Ms. Duffy asked what materials are recycled. Mr. Cushing stated there are paper and plastic among others. He stated there could be more in the future, such as Styrofoam containers. Ms. Wright asked if the use is also a solid waste transfer station. Mr. Goncalves asked for a list of the special permits requested from the ZBA. Ms. Wright noted that E. L. Harvey & Sons had applied to the ZBA for a special permit for a solid waste transfer station. Mr. Hanrahan read a list of the seven special permits requested.

Mr. Cushing stated that a solid waste transfer station is a broader term for a recycling facility, which is a subset. He stated that some transfer stations do less solid waste. He stated that at this site, the solid waste is not the main focus, and that the Harveys focus on the recyclable materials in the waste stream. Ms. Duffy asked how much isn't recyclable. Mr. Cushing noted that some loads will be 95% recyclable, containing materials such as cardboard and bottles. He stated that C&D is different, where now 40 to 70% is recycled, consisting of asphalt, brick, and concrete. He stated that the market is the remodeling industry, not building demolition materials, like metal and sheetrock. He stated that there will be more recycling markets in the future.

Mr. Goncalves stated they are asking for the seven special permits, and he is concerned that changes in the industry in the future might cause the business and processing to change. He stated he is concerned about blanket permits. Mr. Hanrahan stated they expect that the permits will have conditions and that some of the broad language will be addressed. He stated that drainage issues will be reviewed by the Planning Board through the site plan review process.

Mr. Hanrahan stated he wants a sense of how to proceed, and they need to coordinate with the ZBA too. Mr. Coolidge noted that the Site Plan Review bylaw states that the Board can't approve a site plan if special permits aren't issued by the ZBA. He noted that the Board could also further limit the conditions imposed by the ZBA. Mr. Hanrahan asked how it had been handled in the past. Mr. Coolidge stated that the ZBA makes its decision first, then an applicant submits the site plan to the Planning Board. Ms. Altamura noted there could be issues if the Planning Board has to make a decision by a certain date and the ZBA hasn't made its decision yet. Mr. Hanrahan stated he expects to submit an application and have the first Planning Board hearing in late November, and to probably have the ZBA hearing go into the new year.

Mr. Herr asked if all C&D materials are removed from the site, and Mr. Cushing replied yes. Mr. Herr asked if the Harveys sell the materials and buy it from the people who bring it in, or if they sell it for customers. Mr. Cushing stated the Harveys own and manage the materials. He stated they charge less to bring materials to the site than if they were brought to landfills. He stated that recycling markets fluctuate a lot, and it is a worldwide marketplace. Ms. Duffy asked if the price of a material is low, the Harveys hold onto it for a while. She stated she doesn't want a giant pile of bottles on the site, for example. Mr. Cushing stated that the materials would be used on site.

Mr. Goncalves asked if the maintenance garage is for Harvey trucks only, and how many trucks there are. Mr. Cushing stated it is only for Harvey trucks and it could handle 20 vehicles at a

time. Ms. Duffy asked what kind of maintenance is done, and Mr. Cushing stated it could be a tail light or anything. Mr. Hanrahan stated there will be a full range of maintenance, and no service would be provided to others.

Mr. Herr asked what kind of equipment is used on the site, and the amount of equipment. Mr. Cushing stated there will be loaders in the buildings, and they don't know the number yet. He stated that in Westborough, there might be two in a building.

Ms. Altamura asked how many trucks there are today going to the facility in Westborough. Mr. Cushing stated he would have to look it up. Ms. Duffy asked if the Town's recycling facility would still be open for residents, and Mr. Cushing noted it would be relocated but still there. Mr. Goncalves asked about yard waste. Mr. Coolidge stated it is now collected at Weston Nurseries. Mr. Goncalves asked about hazardous waste. Mr. Cushing stated it will not be managed at the site, and the permit requested is for hazardous materials for the buildings, such as used oil, etc. Mr. Herr asked about materials such as fluorescent lamps. Mr. Cushing stated it is in a load, if it will be removed, noting it is a waste ban item and will be placed in a separate container and shipped.

Mr. Hanrahan stated they will file the application within a month, and asked for a schedule of presentations. The Board discussed the submission requirements and timing of the hearing.

Mr. Herr asked how the Board can make sure the hearings focus on issues within the Board's jurisdiction. Mr. Hanrahan stated they will try to narrow the questions, and there are some overlapping issues.

8. Continued Public Hearing – Deerfield Estates – Senior Housing Development Site Plan

The Board voted unanimously to continue the public hearing to 9:15 PM.

9. Joint Meeting – Conservation Commission and Board of Health

Conservation Commission Members Present: Christopher Lee, Richard Litchfield, Brian Morrison, Robert Murphy, Ellen Chagnon: Conservation Scientist, Don MacAdam: Conservation Administrator

Board of Health Members Present: Nancy Peters (Not a quorum)

The Boards discussed a possible Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) nomination for the Whitehall Reservoir area. Ms. Chagnon and Ms. Lazarus provided an overview of the revisions they made to the Whitehall Corridor Extension Proposal dated January 2000. A discussion regarding possible boundaries for a proposed ACEC was held. The Boards decided to contact Mr. Leslie Luchonick, Massachusetts Department of Conservation & Recreation (DCR), and request an electronic copy of a map exhibiting the Whitehall Corridor and the two adjacent ACEC areas. The Boards decided to utilize Route 495, the town property boundary, and the designated boundaries of the two adjacent ACEC territories as an initial proposed boundary for a proposed ACEC. A discussion regarding a potential timeline for the completion of the ACEC application and the scheduling of relevant public informational hearings was held. It was decided that Ms. Chagnon and Ms. Lazarus would continue working on the draft application. Another joint meeting was scheduled for December 8, 2003.

10. Continued Public Hearing – Deerfield Estates – Senior Housing Development Site Plan

Ed Pesce, engineer, Bill Depietri and Gerry Lindsay, Capital Group Properties, applicant, Donald Provencher, engineer, Gary McNaughton, traffic consultant, and Bill Pezzoni, attorney, appeared before the Board. Mr. Pesce stated they have addressed the outstanding items raised by Fay, Spofford & Thorndike (FST), the Board's engineers. He stated they had submitted an updated list of waiver requests, and the specifications on the pipe material that FST requested. He stated the only major change is that the active recreation area has been changed to a putting course. He stated they feel that golf will be more of an attractive amenity for residents. He stated the horseshoe court is still there, and the active recreation areas meet the square footage requirements. He stated they have discussed the intersection with FST and everything is ok, and the diameter of the island at the Road A/Road B intersection is now 10 to 15 ft. wide. He stated that traffic and lighting are issues remaining. He noted that they had brought a sample of the proposed pole-mounted light fixture to the hearing, and it was switched on.

Ms. Altamura noted that the fixture itself is nice, but the light shines up and out and isn't shielded, and it isn't appropriate for this site. She suggested that they look at Liberty Mutual on Frankland Rd. for a good example of lighting. She stated that with the fixture proposed, the site will glow at night. Mr. Goncalves stated that a lot of glare comes from the fixture. Mr. Pesce stated they can add a reflector and prevent light from going up. Ms. Altamura noted that the bulb gives off colored light and she prefers a natural soft bulb. Mr. Goncalves stated that from a residents perspective, he understands the desire for style. He noted that lighting is needed for safety, but they need to strike a balance. Ms. Altamura noted that all units will be lit, and no streetlights are allowed in new subdivisions. She stated that light is not a crime deterrent. Mr. Pezzoni stated that 16 fixtures are proposed, reduced from 32. Mr. Lindsay stated that FST said that the original site plan barely met standards and the Police Chief commented that the original plan was the best. Ms. Altamura noted that the Board takes those comments into account but makes its own decision. Mr. Pezzoni suggested 16 lights with a white bulb and shroud, then reconvening after they are installed, adding that they can tone them down later if there is a problem. Ms. Altamura asked if they brought the shroud with them. Mr. Pesce stated he can fax a copy. Mr. Pezzoni stated they can work with the Board to achieve a balance of aesthetics and safety.

Mr. Depietri stated that at Vickery Hills in Southborough they used these fixtures, and the neighbors complained so they made a metal shroud with holes. He stated it will be more natural, subtle in the woods. Ms. Wright stated they need to light the roads and sidewalks, not beyond that. She stated that Liberty Mutual is a great example. Mr. Lindsay described the proposed light pole locations. He stated they light up a 25 ft. radius and there would be 0.9 foot-candles of light 10 ft. from the light source. The Board discussed the lighting plan and the proposed fixture.

Ms. Altamura noted that the residents won't want light on at night when they are sleeping. She suggested using more residential poles. Mr. Depietri stated they will have a light on the garages and the doors. Mr. Herr stated that he thinks they can find a fixture in a catalog that meets the needs of the developer and the Board. Mr. Goncalves suggested eliminating the poles that aren't located at intersections.

Vince Dempsey, 148 Lumber St., stated there are street lights on Lumber St. now and one is located near one of the future intersections.

Mr. Coolidge stated that the light source needs to be shrouded. Mr. Goncalves suggested six fixtures, located at intersections. Mr. Pesce stated they need ones at the end of the common driveways, and the Board questioned why. Mr. Herr asked if they will be on timers, and Mr. Depietri stated they will have photocells and go off around 12:00 to 1:00 AM. It was decided that there should be 6 shrouded fixtures, a follow up review of a new fixture to be selected, and a new photometric plan submitted.

Mr. Pezzoni addressed the retaining walls, and suggested that the Building Inspector review them later because they will need building permits. He stated they don't know the exact design yet. Mr. Lindsay stated that he submitted a design from the Mass. Highway Dept. to FST and it should be sufficient. He stated they want to provide the detailed information to the Building Inspector later. Mr. Pesce stated that the design will be prepared when the land is staked in the future, in the field. After discussion, Capital Group Properties agreed to forward the materials to FST for review when designed.

Mr. Lindsay stated that the Bd. of Health approved the septic design. He noted that there will be a significant number of inspections of the system during construction, and asked if they can be combined with the Planning Board's inspection process by using the same individual. The Board noted that if the individual is qualified to perform both inspections it would be acceptable.

Mr. Provencher stated they will drill the drinking water and irrigation wells for testing, and monitor three residential wells in the area, two on Lumber St. and one on Glen Rd. Mr. Aghababian asked who will review the results. Mr. Provencher stated that DEP and the Bd. of Health will review the results. He stated the pump rate will be 10 gallons per minute (gpm) at the most to a storage tank to supply a peak demand of 40 to 50 gpm. He stated that DEP issues the two permits and they have the first, which allows the next tests.

Ms. Duffy noted that the State does not require that the private well information be submitted, and asked what will happen if it is found that the new wells will impact the existing wells. She asked if DEP would deny the permit. Mr. Provencher stated they would try to mitigate the impacts, abandon the irrigation well, or find another well location, for example. He stated they will look at the level of impact as well, and they will get three weeks of background information on the private wells before testing. Mr. Goncalves asked what the well pump rate would be, and Mr. Provencher stated it would be less than 7 gpm for regular use, and 7 gpm for the test.

Ms. Altamura asked about landscaping and screening along Lumber St. Mr. Aghababian noted there is a ridge and a dip in the road between the two proposed driveways onto Lumber St. He stated he didn't see how the driveways will be seen by people traveling along Lumber St. Mr. McNaughton stated that the sight distance could be discussed on site after the driveways are in. He stated that the sight distance issue is holding up the final landscape plan, because they don't know which trees will remain. He stated that he used a 2% background growth rate for the traffic study, and FST thought that they should document actual projects. He noted that the conclusions are the same, however, and the increase in delay at the West Main St. intersection is

small. He stated that FST wanted an update of the base condition. He stated they surveyed the signage along Lumber St., and there should be more, such as winding road signs with a 20 mph warning plate, and other speed limit postings. Ms. Rose asked if permits from the State are needed for the signs, and Mr. McNaughton replied no, because there would be no change in the speed limit. The Board stated there did not appear to be a need for additional traffic control signage. Ms. Rose questioned the vertical curve issue raised by FST, and Mr. McNaughton replied that it is within the roadway in the development. Mr. Herr noted that the grade of the road could be changed to improve the sight distance. Mr. Lindsay stated that to take out the knob/ridge, it would mean removal of the trees there. Mr. Depietri stated they could have the northerly road one way in instead. Mr. McNaughton suggested striping the road to lower the speed also.

Ms. Altamura noted that the plan shows the new sidewalk along Lumber St. at 6 ft. wide, and asked if it could be narrower. The consensus was that it should be narrower so it is in keeping with the rural character and that its location should be staked prior to clearing and construction of the sidewalk. Ms. Wright asked why sidewalks inside the development were not proposed, noting that the residents might want to walk. Mr. Pesce stated they were asked to reduce wetland buffer zone encroachment by the Con. Comm., so they eliminated the sidewalk. He stated there will be a nature trail. Ms. Altamura asked if more bushes and shrubs could be planted in the front to preserve the rural character of Lumber St.

Ms. Wright referred to previous discussions relative to the existing old house, and stated that it is important to work with the Historical Commission to find a way to restore or rehabilitate the house. She noted that the applicant has not met with the Historical Comm. yet.

Ms. Altamura asked if there would be permanent development signs on Lumber St., and Mr. Depietri replied no. Mr. Pezzoni asked the Board if they needed a new traffic study, and the Board replied no. Ms. Duffy asked when the lawsuit pending against the Board would be dismissed, and Mr. Pezzoni stated they would do that if the plan is approved.

Ms. Altamura stated that more landscaping is needed between Lumber St. and Road D.

Mary Pratt, 102 Fruit St., stated that people near highways complain about noise and asked if there can be more planting in that area. Mr. Depietri stated they will plant evergreens. Mrs. Pratt stated that a Source Water Protection Plan is being prepared for the Town.

The Board moved and seconded to approve the Site Plan with the following conditions:

1. The Board grants the following waivers from the Subdivision Rules & Regulations:
 - a. Centerline radius for roadway of 90 ft., and 110 ft. of clear sight distance within the roadway to drivers, instead of 150 ft. and 200 ft. respectively, at a location between buildings 14 and 15, as shown on the Site Plan.
 - b. Clear sight distance to drivers less than 200 ft. on interior roadways, where shown on the Site Plan.
 - c. Dead end streets exceeding 500 ft.
 - d. Pavement width of 20 ft. for Roadways C, D, and E, which are dead end streets.

- e. Sidewalks will not be provided along roadways. Instead, the site will contain nature trails in the open space, and the applicant will construct a sidewalk along Lumber St. which connects to an existing sidewalk.
 - f. Sideslopes of 2:1 grade instead of 3:1 where shown on the Site Plan.
 - g. Maximum fill greater than 8 ft. from sta. 10+00 to sta. 11+50 on Road B.
 - h. Storm sewer pipes of high density polyethylene pipe instead of reinforced concrete pipe.
 - i. Stormwater basins located closer than 25 ft. from roadways and property lines, and at intersections. Basins #1 and #3 are within 25 ft. of a roadway. Basin #1 is located at the intersection of Road A and Lumber St.
2. There shall be a maximum of 46 units on the property including the existing house. The style and layout of units shall be as shown on the plan.
 3. The applicant shall provide a performance guarantee in an amount determined by the Board, prior to the commencement of construction. The amount will be determined after review of the applicant's estimate is reviewed by the Town's engineer.
 4. The applicant shall submit all information required by the Board's engineer relative to the proposed roadway retaining walls, including engineered drawings and calculations. All outstanding issues shall be resolved to the satisfaction of the Board prior to the commencement of construction. All necessary modifications to the Plan shall be made prior to construction.
 5. The meandering sidewalk along Lumber St. shall be 4 feet wide instead of the 6 ft. shown on the plan. The location of the sidewalk shall be staked in the field for Board review prior to its construction. The sidewalk shall meander around natural features as necessary.
 6. Construction of all infrastructure shall be completed within 2 years from the date of commencement. The applicant shall notify the Board of the intent to begin work at least 24 hours in advance.
 7. If the unit designs are substantially modified from those submitted to the Board, the applicant shall return to the Board for a review to determine compliance with the Site Plan and bylaw requirements.
 8. If construction has not commenced within one year of the date of this Decision, approval shall be automatically rescinded, unless such time is extended by the Board at the request of the applicant.
 9. Construction of the infrastructure shall be in accordance with the procedures in the Subdivision Rules and Regulations and the inspection process administered by the Board.
 10. Within 60 days of this decision, the applicant shall provide the Planning Board with a complete, up-to-date set of approved plans which includes all revisions.
 11. The exterior of the existing house on the property shall be retained and shall be renovated so as to be historically accurate in the opinion of the Hopkinton Historical Commission.
 12. Documents establishing the condominium association shall be submitted to the Planning Board prior to the issuance of the first building permit in the development.
 13. Maintenance of all roads and driveways, including snow plowing and repairs, shall be the responsibility of the owners and not the Town.
 14. Lighting shall be directed away from adjoining property, and shall be directed downward, not up or outward. The selection of the light fixture and pole locations shall be resolved by the Board and the applicant prior to construction. The applicant shall propose revisions to the submitted lighting plan with respect to the type of fixture and pole locations. It is the Board's understanding that the intersections will be illuminated.

15. A combination of shrubs and trees for screening and landscaping purposes a minimum of 15 ft. in width shall be provided adjacent to each property line, as required by the bylaw.
16. The roadways/driveways shall be designated with Town approved street names, and each unit shall be given a street number. The Director of Municipal Inspections shall be consulted on the numbering system. The approved names and street numbers shall be shown on the plan prior to endorsement.
17. The condominium association shall be responsible for the maintenance and inspection of all stormwater management. The applicant shall submit an operation and maintenance plan for review and approval by the Planning Board.
18. The applicant shall submit a plan of all signs proposed for the development, with the exception of traffic signs, for Board approval. The plan shall show proposed locations, size, materials and illumination and shall be submitted and reviewed prior to issuance of the first building permit. No signs shall be erected without prior Planning Board approval. There shall be no permanent development sign at the entrances.
19. All designated open space shall remain in its natural state, with the exception that trails may be constructed. No designated open space may be disturbed during construction and it may not be used for storage of materials, vehicles or equipment. Open space may not be developed for active recreational uses.
20. Erosion and sedimentation control measures shall be implemented during construction. If they are found to be inadequate, the applicant shall immediately correct any deficiencies. The Planning Board may stop work on the project until erosion and sedimentation issues are adequately addressed.
21. No construction shall commence until full approval of a water supply and sewage disposal system has been received.
22. No construction shall commence until full approval of the fire protection and prevention system has been received by the Fire Chief.
23. The Board will visit the site when the roadway entrances onto Lumber St. are constructed with the gravel base. At this time, the Board will review the sight distance to drivers along Lumber St., and decide which trees must be removed to provide the necessary safety to drivers and pedestrians.
24. Additional landscaping for screening purposes shall be provided between Lumber St. and the proposed development in order to maintain the rural character of the street. The applicant shall submit a new landscape plan for this area showing the exact species and quantities of plant materials after the Board has identified the trees to be removed along Lumber St. for sight distance purposes

Mr. Depietri addressed condition #11 relative to the existing house. He stated that a structural engineer has surveyed it and is surprised that it is still standing. Ms. Wright noted that people can find ways to save a structure, and it is the exterior that is important here. She stated it needs to go through the process. Mr. Pezzoni stated they want to at least do a reproduction if it isn't possible to save it. Ms. Altamura noted that every effort should be made to save it. It was decided to modify condition #11 as follows:

11. The exterior of the existing house on the property shall be retained and shall be renovated or reproduced so as to be historically accurate in the opinion of the Historical Commission. The Board understands that the applicant will make every reasonable effort to save and renovate the existing exterior of the building before demolition and reproduction is proposed.

The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion to approve the Site Plan with the conditions as modified. The Board voted unanimously to close the public hearing.

11. Brook Hollow

Mr. Depietri noted that at a previous meeting the Board voted to reduce the Brook Hollow Estates performance guarantee to \$20,000 and he thinks it should be lower. He noted that the funds were held for street trees, and all were planted 18 months ago and all will survive. Mr. Lindsay noted they were planted about 12 months ago. The Board stated it is its policy to hold the funds until it can be assured the trees will survive, and noted that a reduction might be appropriate in the spring.

12. Next Generation Children's Center – 2 Wood St.

The Board continued its earlier discussion. The Board decided to require that the main entrance to the building should be within 5 feet of the southwesterly corner, as that was the intent of the previous negotiation and discussion.

Adjourned: 10:45 PM

Elaine C. Lazarus, Planning Director

Approved: December 8, 2003