

## HOPKINTON PLANNING BOARD

Monday, May 23, 2005 7:30 PM  
High School Auditorium

### MINUTES

---

PRESENT: Mark Abate, Chairman, Brian Herr, Vice Chairman, Scott Aghababian, Sandy K. Altamura, Evan Ballantyne, John H. Coolidge, R.J. Dourney, Jaime Goncalves, Claire Wright

.....Elaine C. Lazarus, Planning Director

#### **1. Reorganization**

Mr. Coolidge welcomed Mr. Dourney to the Planning Board. He opened the floor to nominations for Planning Board Chairman. Mr. Herr nominated Mark Abate. He stated it is no reflection on Mr. Coolidge who has done a good job, but he believes that organizations need to be shaken up from time to time with new energy and new voices. Mr. Aghababian seconded the nomination. Ms. Altamura nominated Mr. Coolidge. She stated if something isn't broken, it doesn't need to be fixed. She noted that the Chairmanship requires time and energy, and it's not just attending meetings. She stated that Mr. Coolidge has done an outstanding job. Ms. Wright seconded the motion.

Mr. Coolidge stated he doesn't think that politics should enter into the Planning Board's business, and he is discouraged that it has now reached the Board. He stated the Board operates under rules and regulations, and politics doesn't enter into it. He stated he has enjoyed working with Mr. Goncalves in the last few years, and they have led the Board openly and honestly. He noted that the Board needs to deal with what is before it in an apolitical way and the Board should avoid politics.

Mr. Abate stated that Mr. Coolidge has done a good job and this isn't a political play. He stated that the people in Town have voiced their opinion on Planning Board leadership by electing Mr. Dourney to the Board. He stated the Board should respond accordingly.

Mr. Goncalves stated that Mr. Coolidge has done an excellent job and he often attends meetings every night as well as during the day and puts in time on weekends too, which is more than the Board has a right to expect. He stated that if Mr. Coolidge is not re-elected, all members need to step up and take responsibility for these things because Mr. Abate might not be able to do so much with his work schedule. He stated he doesn't want to hear complaints from others about how Planning Board representatives aren't showing up where they need to. He asked Mr. Abate if he plans to put in the time and attend the meetings, and Mr. Abate replied yes.

Ms. Wright stated that Mr. Coolidge brings expertise and time to the Board. She stated all members have been treated fairly and consistently, as has the public. She stated that it would normally be the Vice Chair who would be elected if a Chairman is stepping down, and Mr.

Goncalves has done a good job. She stated the Chairman is an important position and she supports Mr. Coolidge.

Mr. Herr stated he appreciates the perception of politics, but this is not on his mind and he doesn't care about that. He stated the Board should allow others the chance to be Chairman.

Board members voted on the nominations as follows:

John Coolidge: Altamura, Wright, Goncalves, Coolidge in favor

Mark Abate: Herr, Aghababian, Abate, Dourney, Ballantyne in favor

The floor was opened to nominations for Vice Chairman. Mr. Aghababian nominated Mr. Herr, and the motion was seconded. Mr. Coolidge nominated Mr. Goncalves, and the motion was seconded. Mr. Coolidge stated that Mr. Goncalves has done a good job and should be re-elected. Mr. Herr advocated for change. Mr. Goncalves stated he would like to withdraw his nomination. The Board voted unanimously in favor of Mr. Herr as Vice Chairman.

**2. Continued Public Hearing – Whitehall Estates – Garden Apartment Concept Plan and Public Hearing – Preliminary Subdivision Plan – Whitehall Estates - 279 Wood St.**

Ron Nation, applicant, Brian Levey, attorney, John Thomas, Dan Feeney, and Kristin Wilson, Beals & Thomas, Dave Healey, Tighe & Bond, and Sean Kelly, Vanasse & Associates, appeared before the Board.

Jeff Furber, 232 Wood St., stated that Karl Mighton had passed away earlier in the day, and requested a moment of silence in his memory. He stated that Mr. Mighton loved his wife Margaret, Whitehall, and life.

The Board paused the meeting for a moment of silence.

Andre Griben, 6 Winter St., asked the Board to set ground rules for the hearing and asked for equal time for both sides and rebuttal time.

Mr. Aghababian suggested an order of presentations then time for the general public. Mr. Herr suggested 15 minutes for each side in the reverse order than the last hearing, with the opponents going first.

Jonathan White, attorney, stated that last time the proponent used a lot of time and the abutters were not able to finish their comments. He asked if the Board would hear them now.

Mr. Abate stated that Mr. Coolidge had previously agreed to give 15 minutes to each side with the abutters going first.

Steve Warren, 23 Parker Point Rd., introduced Bill Madden to speak on his behalf.

Bill Madden, landscape architect, stated he was hired to evaluate the quantitative aspects of the views from Lake Whitehall before and after the project. He described a silhouetting affect, where light reflects off buildings and highlights them in cleared areas. He stated this highlights

new construction, and showed photographs which illustrated the concept. He stated it is detrimental to the landscape. Mr. Goncalves asked if there are examples in the photographs where evergreens are used for screening instead of deciduous trees. Mr. Madden referred to a photo of the Shepard house, which is behind tall white pines with a high canopy. Mr. Abate asked what time of day the pictures were taken. Mr. Madden stated he didn't know. Brian Morrison, 22 Piazza Lane, stated they were taken between 10:00 AM and 2:00 PM. Mary Pratt, 102 Fruit St., asked if there are pictures taken at night. Mr. Morrison replied no.

Sarah Stedt, 184 Pond St., stated they were told that no structures would be seen from Wood St., but noted that in a recent photo of the existing house at 279 Wood St., a blue tarp can clearly be seen behind it. Mr. Madden stated that is the location of a proposed building.

David Adelman, 183 Pond St., asked why Mr. Abate wanted to know what time the photos were taken. Mr. Abate stated that it appeared the sun might have been coming from the west and that could cause the silhouetting to be more prominent.

Barry Richards, 39 Parker Point Rd., addressed the issue raised at the last hearing where Ms. Gates of the Parks & Recreation Commission stated that there have been complaints over the years with regard to the Reed Park access off Parker Point Rd. He stated there have been complaints about volume of traffic and speed, but he doesn't think that Whitehall Estates is the answer to the problem. He stated he is concerned about the use of that driveway as an alternative access to the development. He stated that when the Wood St. traffic volume increases in the future, the old Reed Park access will be opened up again and used for the Park and the new development. He stated this will result in a future negative impact on the neighborhood. He stated the Board's engineer raised this issue, and read from a letter submitted by Fay, Spofford & Thorndike (FST) relative to the possible need for off-site easements. He stated the Town purchased the Park for a playground and park. He stated the proposed road is a change of use which should be addressed by the Board or Town Meeting prior to the grant of a special permit.

Gail Clifford, 232 Wood St., stated she is working with others to write a book about Woodville. She stated that John Wood set up a sawmill there in 1724 and built homes there. She stated the house at 279 Wood St. was built in the 1830's or 1840's, and Town Meeting overwhelmingly voted to create a Historic District in Woodville. She stated that the history and architecture should not be compromised. She stated she has three concerns regarding the future of the house: 1) the blue tarp in the house photo represents the location and height of a building, but not the bulk. She stated it will affect the streetscape, noting that screening will be very expensive and unlikely to happen. 2) An addition would be necessary to use the house as a two-unit condominium building, and no plans have been provided. 3) Moving the stone walls in front of the house will be necessary to achieve sight distance, and this will compromise the ambiance of the house. She stated that the public survey submitted previously was clear that those signing feel that the development is undesirable and detrimental. She stated this speaks to two of the special permit criteria, which are clearly not met. She asked that the Board deny the permit.

Mr. Levey stated the applicant will focus on the two issues the Board asked them to address, the impact of the septic system and the viewshed.

Mr. Thomas showed the delineation of the Zone 2 to Town wells, which has been approved by the Mass. Department of Environmental Protection (DEP). He stated the site is clearly outside the Zone 2. He stated it is in the Zone 3, in which surface and groundwater drains to the Zone 2. He stated that all of the Zone 2 arguments made regarding nitrogen sensitive areas are without merit, because nitrogen sensitive areas are not Zone 3.

Mr. Healey described a typical wastewater treatment system and also with the addition of the proposed biofilter system. He stated he has reviewed the design, and concluded that it has been designed in accordance with good engineering practice. He stated that the setbacks and the design greatly exceed DEP minimum requirements and it will provide treatment. He showed a comparison of the amount of pollutants in effluent as it passes through a system, and with the biofilter system. He noted that with the biofilter, pollutants are greatly reduced, and the quality of liquid going into the soil absorption system is better than typical. He reviewed the criteria for establishing nitrogen sensitive areas: 1) Zone 2; 2) Interim Wellhead Protection Area; 3) coastal area; 4) residential development where there is both on-site water and wastewater. He stated that none of the criteria are met and it is not a nitrogen sensitive area. He stated that Title V setback requirements are all exceeded. He stated the site can support 10 single family homes plus the existing house, for 7,040 gallons per day of effluent, which is comparable to what is proposed. He noted that there is a better chance of sewage system maintenance over time with a condominium association than with individual homeowners.

Mr. Aghababian asked for information about the size of the system near the lake and proximity of the system to the neighbor's well, as it relates to proposed grading of the site.

Mr. Thomas showed the location of the proposed system, the Lake, the house at 22 Piazza Ln. and its well. He stated the system will be 450 feet from the lake. He stated the well at 22 Piazza Ln. is 190 feet from the property line, but the septic system will be 350 feet from the well. He stated that the sewage disposal system will be located on a ridgeline and the flow direction is expected to be in all directions because of that. Mr. Goncalves asked if that would change because of the proposed grading. Mr. Thomas noted that the Title V fill will make the soils more permeable so it will disperse evenly throughout that area, but because of the natural soils and ridge, most is expected to eventually flow north and east rather than south.

Mr. Abate asked about the maintenance requirements, who will maintain the system, and how they will know if there is a failure. Mr. Healey stated it is expected that the Association will hire a certified firm to perform the required maintenance and inspections.

Alex Griben, 6 Winter St., stated the lake will be different if the project is built. He stated when there was a meteor shower recently, many people in the neighborhood went outside to see it, but if this is built they couldn't do that because of the lights. He stated he is a fisherman and boater on the lake, and rides his bike and walks the trails through the property. He stated that traffic is an issue and it is unsafe to cross the roads now. He stated he wants to stop the project.

Kevin Kohrt, 35 Winter St., stated he is concerned about the traffic situation and has looked at the calculations. He submitted his analysis to the Board. He stated the survey was taken at non-peak hours and the hill was not taken into consideration when calculating stopping distance. He

stated the situation there isn't safe and the Board should deny the plan. He stated it can't be made safe without taking out the hill on Wood St.

Mr. Abate noted that a traffic study would be submitted with the Site Plan. Mr. Kohrt stated the plan can't be made to conform, no matter what the applicant does.

Jeffrey Karg, 2 Whitehall Ln., stated they recently added a bedroom, his system failed Title V, and had to be expanded. He stated he is a registered engineer in New Jersey. He stated he is grateful for the requirement to provide good water to the area and the regulations that resulted in the upgrade of his system. He stated the taste of the Town water has changed over the last few years for the worse. He stated that the project is upstream from the Zone 2 and the water will become undrinkable like it has in other places. He stated there shouldn't be high density housing near a water supply. He stated that a sewage treatment plant is proposed for Fruit St. with wells nearby and that's a lot of sewage so close to a water supply. He stated that the applicant has said that 11 single family homes will generate over 7,000 gallons per day, and there will be only 8,000 gallons per day for 37 condominiums. He stated that people who live in condominiums use the same amount of water as other people and 37 units multiplied by 3 to 4 people per unit equals 111 to 118 people, which is more than 11 luxury houses. He stated he is also concerned about the runoff containing fertilizers, etc. He stated there has been a growth in truck traffic since 1997 when he moved there, and the entrance to the project should be at the crest of the hill because people won't be able to see looking left coming out of the development.

Mr. Thomas showed photographs illustrating there are more pines between 22 Piazza Ln. and the Lake than the Shepard house and the Lake. He stated that the Shepard house has an open lawn area. He noted, however, that there is a 150 ft. wide area next to that with dense pines which will remain unaffected. He stated they intend to plant where the Shepard clearing is. He noted that the proposed triplex will be 110 feet long, the Morrison house at 22 Piazza Ln. is 122 ft. long, the proposed 4-unit building is 130 ft. long, and 279 Wood St. is 100 ft. long. He stated the proposed buildings are in scale with the existing buildings.

Mr. Herr asked how wide and high the proposed buildings are. Mr. Thomas stated they will be 25 feet high to the roof peak and 45 feet wide.

Mr. Ballantyne asked how the amount of effluent was calculated. Mr. Thomas stated that the calculation for condominiums is 110 gallons per bedroom, and the bylaw limits the number of bedrooms per unit to two.

Kim Cahill, 98 Spring St., asked about the proposed elevation of the buildings versus the existing elevations for the Morrison and Shepard houses. Mr. Thomas stated they have not been on the Morrison property so they don't know the elevation, but noted that one new building is proposed in the location of the existing Shepard residence.

Mark Nelson, Horsley Witten Group, stated the Board's decision is not about whether it complies with Title V or the Wetlands Protection Act, but that it complies with the bylaw. He stated that the Board must find that it is desirable and not a detriment. He stated that the system can be engineered for clean effluent but the question is whether the development is appropriate

here. He stated that just because it complies with Title V doesn't mean that it is appropriate in this location. He stated it will affect a private well and it has a larger septic system than a typical single family house. He stated that different numbers have been generated from each consultant, and probably the outcome will meet neither estimate. He stated that a lot of phosphorus will be coming from the large system, and it will use up the binding ability in the soil quicker than a single family house would, because of the larger amount of effluent. He stated it is in a Zone 3 and there is a direct connection from the Lake to Town wells, affecting the sole source aquifer. He asked if this is desirable here.

Ms. Altamura asked if the Waterloo Biofilter would reduce phosphorus levels. Mr. Nelson stated it will treat some of it, and there will need to be other technologies to remove more. He stated it is primarily used to reduce things like nitrogen, suspended solids, etc. He stated that phosphorus and viruses are less affected.

Mr. Healey agreed. He noted that the project is only conceptually designed at this point, and as it is further designed there could be additional technology added to remove more. He stated that Title V is a regulation that is intended to protect the public. He stated the Zone 2 was prepared by EarthTech and they did not find that the Zone 2 extended into the Lake.

Mr. Nelson stated that Title V is not the be-all and end-all for large septic systems, and literature indicates that more distance is needed for them.

Paul August, 65 Winter St., asked that all Friends of Whitehall stand. He stated that 1,360 people signed petitions specifically opposing the granting of the special permit, and this is the voice of the people. He stated the development is not desirable, noting that 1,200 of the signatures were from Hopkinton residents. He stated that the project does not comply with state and federal regulations, including Title V, Outstanding Resource Waters, vernal pools, and Impaired Resource Waters. He stated that some have said that if the project is denied, it could be submitted under Chapter 40B. He stated that those state regulations would still have to be met, so the fear is unfounded. He stated that the Sanctuary Lane 40B plan has been going on for 4 years and a better plan resulted, so people shouldn't be fearful. He referred to language in the Board's Garden Apartment Submission Requirements and Procedures Manual indicating that the plan should be denied. He stated there is a legal basis to deny the plan.

Jean Vickers, 11 Donna Pass, asked how many members attended the site walk. All Board members raised their hands, except Mr. Dourney who was not a member at the time and Mr. Herr. Mr. Herr stated he went at a different time by himself. Ms. Vickers stated the sight line for traffic is the biggest issue, and there are a lot of school buses in the morning rush hour. She stated there will be accidents as a result.

Dale Cook, 8 Fruit St., stated there has been insufficient and conflicting information and data submitted. He stated that if the Board denies the application, there will be a loss of diversity, growth, and developer profits, but these should be balanced with the benefits. He asked what happens if the water is contaminated and where will clean water come from? He stated the location is a bad one and the application should be denied.

Mr. Goncalves referred to the memo regarding traffic submitted by FST, noting that there are currently about 5,900 average daily trips on Wood St., and with additional trips from E. L. Harvey & Sons, Stagecoach Heights, and Whitehall Estates, it amounts to about 1,000 more trips per day. He stated that much of the E. L. Harvey trips include truck traffic.

David Goldman, 20 Fruit St., stated the Board should also consider traffic generated by the Town's proposed use of the land it owns on Fruit Street, plus Reed Park. It was noted that there will be a new elementary school on Fruit St.

Sean Kelly, traffic engineer, stated he looked at the impacts on Wood St., noting that in the peak hours, there are 550 cars passing by the site in the morning and 600 in the evening. He stated that traffic will increase all over Town by 10 to 15% anyway, with existing development. He stated that the Whitehall Estates project will result in a 0.7% to 2.5% increase. He stated that the project will generate 19 morning peak hour trips and 18 evening peak hour trips, which is one trip every other minute. He stated that the driveway is projected to have a level of service (LOS) B. He noted that the question has been raised about the amount of traffic generated by Reed Park, and that the existing road is inefficient. He stated that with the additional traffic at the new driveway, it will still be at LOS B. He noted that parks have little use at weekday peak hours, and are mostly used on weekends and at off-peak hours. He stated that currently the sight distance doesn't work on Wood St., but that it can with grading on the site. He referred to comments made by Mr. Kohrt, noting that off-peak speed data is used because it is more indicative of actual speeds and is the accepted industry standard. He stated that traffic is too slow in the peak hour, with school buses, etc. to provide accurate data. He noted that information presented by Mr. Kohrt about the hill is also inaccurate and wrong, and that one would want to adjust for it because it takes longer to stop when going downhill, but when one is at the crest, one can stop in a shorter distance. He stated that an adjustment would improve the situation.

Mr. Aghababian noted the Board has received a lot of information this evening, and asked what else will be learned through the hearing process. He asked if the hearing should be closed. Ms. Altamura noted the Board usually spends more time hashing things out with the applicant, and this hasn't happened yet. Mr. Herr asked if it is a property the Board wants to negotiate. Mr. Coolidge stated the Board hasn't talked about the dual entrance versus single entrance, density, future use of the old house, and waivers. He stated the Board shouldn't close the hearing if it needs more information.

Mr. Adelman stated the Board has received enough information. Mrs. Pratt cited concerns with phosphorus.

The Board voted 8 in favor, with Mr. Dourney abstaining, to continue the public hearings to Monday, June 20, 2005 at 7:30 PM. The Board noted that at this meeting, there would be an agenda of items to discuss and that all written comments must be received by 12:00 noon on June 16. The Board received a request for an extension of time to file its decision on the preliminary subdivision plan, and voted unanimously to extend the time to June 24, 2005.

### **3. Deerfield Estates**

Bill Depietri and Gerry Lindsey, Capital Group Properties, appeared before the Board. Mr. Lindsey referred to materials submitted to the Board which described a timeline of events regarding their discussion about the disposition of the house at 148 Lumber St. with the Historical Commission. The house is within the Deerfield Estates Senior Housing Development. Mr. Lindsey referred to the Board's decision and asked what is meant by "reasonable efforts".

Mr. Herr asked if the 6 month delay imposed by the Commission under the Historic Preservation bylaw is a moot point. Ms. Wright noted it is not moot because of the Board's condition of approval.

Ms. Wright stated she understands that the Historical Commission wanted to meet in the field to see what items could be saved, and they need direct contact with the architect or engineer. She stated the house has deteriorated, and they wanted to see what materials or parts of the exterior could be saved to maintain the streetscape. She stated it is only one of four houses in Hopkinton left that were built in the 1700's, and is very significant. Mr. Herr asked if the timeline is accurate, and Ms. Wright stated she doesn't know, but she thinks there have been repeated efforts to meet on site. Mr. Ballantyne stated there should be a site visit now unless time is a problem.

Bill Shaw, Historical Commission, stated that the owner wants to build a replica in the current location and not save anything. He stated that the Historical Commission needs to be diligent in determining if the existing structure can be saved, so they need to meet with the engineer on site to learn why some things aren't feasible. He stated they need good information in order to consider all of the options.

Mr. Lindsey stated a site walk was set and only one person came, admitting that it should have been rescheduled. He stated there has been a breakdown in communication. He noted they are willing to save some features like the front door and clapboards. He stated the house construction all bears on the center chimney, so it can't be jacked up. He stated that two people referred by the Town and two others have looked at it and no one has expressed interest in re-using the frame. He stated the architect has documented, photographed and measured the house. He stated the replica plans have no change to the massing and they will reuse the front door. He stated they will also keep the well head. He noted they are planning to have a seating area along the path on Lumber St. He added that the house was neglected.

Mrs. Pratt stated there should be a deed restriction requiring future changes to the house to go to the Historical Commission. Mr. Lindsey stated they can put that in the condominium documents.

Roger Mezitt, Historical Commission, stated there has been a lack of understanding since the beginning. He stated that a replica doesn't meet the criteria of the Commission. He stated a builder is interested in moving the house. He noted that they want to meet with the engineer who did the study, and they think the developer is waiting the clock out. Mr. Ballantyne asked how much more time is needed to address this, and Mr. Mezitt stated he doesn't know, and they need information.

Mr. Depietri stated the engineer's report on the house was done in 2003, and they have not received anything back from the Commission about the report, which was thorough. He noted that it also documented the structure. He stated they have tried to get together and it isn't their fault the Commission can't get a quorum. He stated the house is falling apart and no one wants it.

Mr. Abate asked how the Commission would feel if someone wants to move it. Mr. Mezitt stated he would prefer to keep it in Hopkinton, but if it has to go to Southborough, as has been mentioned, that could be ok. He stated they need to discuss the house with the engineer. Mr. Herr asked about setting a deadline and appointing a Planning Board contact person/liaison regarding the issue. Mr. Herr volunteered.

Ms. Wright noted that the Commission was told they would have the opportunity to meet on site in December, 2004, and it could be solved now if the developer could say they intend to meet on site. Ms. Altamura stated she thought the house was going to be kept there to preserve the Lumber St. streetscape. Mr. Goncalves asked if they can meet within the next two weeks, and Mr. Mezitt and Mr. Depietri replied yes. Mr. Shaw stated they also need someone there who can talk about the costs of various options. Mr. Depietri stated he isn't sure there is a person like that, but they can come with the architect. It was decided to resolve the issue by the next Planning Board meeting.

#### **4. Deneen Scarlata Family Subdivision**

It was noted that there had been no appeal of the Board's decision approving the Deneen Scarlata definitive subdivision plan. The Board reviewed the Conditional Approval Agreement, and it was noted that the modifications to the plan requested by the Board's approval had been completed. The Board voted unanimously to approve the Conditional Approval Agreement. The Board voted unanimously to approve the Covenant pertaining to use of the common open space. The Board voted unanimously to endorse the definitive subdivision plan.

#### **5. Oak Hill Estates**

Jack Bartolini, developer, requested the release of the remaining performance guarantee funds held for the Oak Hill Estates subdivision. It was noted that Huckleberry Rd. was accepted as a public way at the May, 2005 annual town meeting and all work was complete. Mr. Bartolini stated that the catch basins had been cleaned and the road swept. The Board asked if Ms. Lazarus had received a reply from the DPW Director as to whether there are outstanding issues there, and she noted that she had not, but that as of the date of the Town Meeting there were no issues. The Board voted unanimously to authorize the release of the remaining performance guarantee.

#### **6. Main St./West Main St./Wood St. Intersection Traffic Study**

Ms. Lazarus showed the Board a new plan for the Main St./West Main St./Wood St. intersection provided by J.T. Gaucher, DPW Director. The Board reviewed the material submitted and Mr. Gaucher's request for transfer of the \$25,000 the Board holds from the Next Generation Children's Center, which is intended for use in the study and/or implementation of the intersection as it relates to the Center. The funds would reimburse the DPW for a portion of a traffic study of the intersection. The Board noted that thus far, none of the plans for the

intersection have been oriented to addressing the day care center traffic, especially relating to turning in and out of Meserve St. The Board observed that the plans were to resolve pre-existing problems, not those related to the day care center. The Board voted unanimously to authorize the transfer of \$1,690.00 to the DPW to cover preparation of the plan reviewed this evening, which shows a widening of West Main St. and an eastbound left turn lane at Meserve St. The Board noted it would hold the remaining funds pending a design that is geared to the day care center, which was the intention of the owner when donating the money to the Town.

**7. Maspenock Woods**

Ms. Lazarus asked the Board if it would like to hire a landscape architect to review Maspenock Woods along with its engineer, as it has often done with OSLPD plans. She noted that a cost estimate had been received and it would not exceed \$3,000. It was noted that the developer would pay for the review. The Board voted unanimously to hire the landscape architect.

**8. Other Business**

The Board voted unanimously to pay outstanding bills. The Board voted unanimously to approve the Minutes of April 25, 2005. The Board voted unanimously to approve the Minutes of May 9, 2005.

**EMC Park** – Ms. Lazarus noted that the Parks & Recreation Commission had received an Order of Conditions from the Conservation Commission to pave the driveway and parking lot at EMC Park. She referred to a letter from the Board to Parks & Rec. in 2003 indicating that no Planning Board approval was necessary to pave, and asked if the Board’s opinion has changed since then. The Board noted that its opinion had not changed and there did not appear to be any condition of its approval that precluded the driveway and parking lot from being paved in the future.

Adjourned: 10:30 PM

Elaine C. Lazarus, Planning Director

Approved: June 13, 2005