

HOPKINTON PLANNING BOARD

Monday, November 28, 2005 7:30 PM
Hopkinton Town Hall

MINUTES

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

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

1. Administrative Business

The Board voted unanimously to pay outstanding bills.

Mr. Goncalves and Mr. Coolidge arrived at this time.

2. Continued Public Hearing – Deerfield Estates – 148 Lumber St. – Proposed Amendment to Senior Housing Development Special Permit – Capital Group Properties

Bill Pezzoni, attorney, and Bill Fleming, landscape architect, appeared before the Board. Mr. Fleming described revisions to the landscape plan including an evergreen screen around the old house at 148 Lumber St. He noted that the landscaping would provide a setting for the historic house. He stated that the new driveway for the house would be circular with a gravel surface, 12 to 15 ft. wide and there would be a stone dust path to the front door. He noted there would be a picket fence and the well house would be relocated but remain. He stated they would also add a gravel drip strip around the house. He stated they are trying to keep green space in the front of the home. He stated that the landscape plan for this area plus the berm along Lumber St. shows 128 trees to be planted, 75 of which would be evergreens. He stated that shrubs would also be planted. He stated the driveway surface would actually be a sand and gravel mix to mimic an old driveway. He stated that historic landscape details, such as a vegetable garden or roses, could be added later, depending on the desires of the Historical Commission and the building's proposed use.

Ms. Altamura stated that the proposed driveway is a good size, and the area looks good with the trees in the back because it would break up the mass of building behind it. She noted that the landscaping should be kept simple and require little maintenance. Mr. Fleming stated they would add a stone wall along Lumber St. also.

Ms. Altamura asked if the condominium association would mow the lawn. Mr. Pezzoni stated the Historical Commission would be responsible for the maintenance and it will be on a lot separate from the condominium complex. He referred to other changes to the concept plan for the Senior Housing Development, noting that the smaller one-unit buildings will break the massing up and the berm with landscaping will screen the area. Mr. Pezzoni distributed a list of work that Capital Group Properties will do with respect to the house before transferring

ownership. He stated they would maintain electric service to the building as well. He stated that the house has an existing well that would remain, so it will have water. He stated the house will not be connected to a septic system. Mr. Coolidge noted that if water is going in, then it has to come out somewhere. Mr. Pezzoni agreed, stating that they then will connect it to the septic system for the condominium, but the building will not be for habitation. He stated the planting plan will be further refined as the process goes along. He stated the house will have power, water, and septic, which would be either the condominium system or a new system with the house.

Mr. Goncalves noted that at the last meeting there were questions about what would need to be done for the Historical Commission to gain a certificate of occupancy, and asked if anyone had spoken to the Building Inspector.

Michaelyn Holmes, Chair, Historical Commission, stated that they have spoken to the Building Inspector and understand that it is a pre-existing historical building which will be required to meet different building code conditions, and a structural engineer will be required to look at it to make that case. She stated that a permit will be needed to do the work that Capital Group has outlined, and they will develop a written agreement between the parties regarding the work that will be done. She stated that they won't get this in writing until they know the Planning Board will approve the change and it is a viable project, but after that Town Counsel will meet with the developer's attorney to work out the details. She stated they will not use the building for habitation, and it will just have a low level use. She stated it is likely they will not use the upper level of the building, but would like the lower level to code when it is delivered. She stated the landscape plan looks good. She noted that they would apply for a waiver from ADA requirements from the State at some point.

Mr. Pezzoni stated the developer could have demolished the building, but they have tried to work with everyone on this. He stated they need the extra unit in the complex, but with that it still won't cover the cost of this effort. He stated that without the extra unit, the planned donation to the Historical Commission and the work to restore the building won't happen.

Mr. Abate stated he needs more research to be done, as he understands that four homes in Wildwood Glen, the adjacent subdivision, have well water supply issues since this development went in. Mr. Pezzoni stated that before construction, DEP well approval testing was done in the area and the problems referred to are likely pre-existing. He stated that the pumping tests done with the new well showed draws from a different area. He stated that the Wildwood Glen wells draw from the Pulte Home Corp. (Higgins Farm) side of the property.

Jane Anderson, 6 Lowell Drive, asked if the pump tests done by Deerfield Estates took into consideration the new irrigation well. Mr. Pezzoni stated that Wildwood Glen draws from behind this area, not from Deerfield Estates. He stated they spent a lot of money on the testing, meters, and monitoring when they ran the pump for 3 to 4 days. He stated that the tests showed no significant changes to the abutting wells. Ms. Anderson stated the new irrigation well is in the back yard of her unit. Mr. Pezzoni stated that all the wells have been permitted as required.

Ellen Makynen, 143 Lumber St., asked why they need to separate the two and three unit buildings into single buildings. She stated the end result is that they aren't clustered anymore, resulting in bigger footprints and bigger yards. She asked how much more building there would be, and how close to the road it would end up. She stated that it is directly across from her front yard. She asked how much longer there will be dust and dirt from there, which has come into her house and caused problems. She stated the units as moved around are at her front yard.

Mr. Aghababian asked if the detached units have a higher sales price. Mr. Pezzoni replied yes, but they are more expensive to build also. Mr. Aghababian stated the overall price per unit is higher than was originally represented to the Board. Mr. Goncalves stated he thought it was consistent with what was represented. Mr. Pezzoni stated they are trying to cut massing down in the front.

Ms. Anderson stated the original plan had houses along a street in a neighborhood design, but on the revised plan it is more mixed up and not cohesive.

Mrs. Makynen asked how close to Lumber St. the new unit would be, and Mr. Pezzoni replied it would be about 50 feet closer to the street.

Ms. Wright stated that in one respect, the new plan with the house closer provides a better streetscape in that a house with landscaping will be seen instead of street pavement, but with the detached buildings, there is a price difference. She noted there would be six new single units which is a big increase in profit for the developer. She stated she is concerned about the proximity of the unit closest to the old house because it detracts from its setting, and asked if that one could be eliminated. Mr. Dourney stated the unit close to Lumber St. should be moved back farther. Mr. Ballantyne asked if it could be relocated in the back part of the development. Mr. Pezzoni stated they can't do that. He stated that if this isn't going to work they will tear the house down, and they have worked cooperatively with people for a year on this.

Mr. Goncalves asked if the extra unit could be included but attach them so there is a triple unit building instead of singles. Mr. Pezzoni stated he doesn't have the authority to commit to that.

Mr. Abate stated the well issue should be investigated. Mr. Pezzoni asked what data there is regarding that issue. Mr. Abate stated he didn't know. Mr. Pezzoni stated he hadn't heard anything about it. Mr. Abate stated that it should be investigated and researched. Mr. Goncalves noted that their well pumping limit established by DEP isn't going to change, whether or not they add another unit, and the well will function as permitted by DEP. He stated that the original reports received from the Board's engineer as well as others could be reviewed.

Mr. Coolidge stated there has been a lot of effort to save the old house, and he would like to get this done. He stated the Board has tried to save the old house at all costs. Mrs. Makynen asked who will maintain the house and keep the skunks out of the basement. It was stated that the Historical Commission will be responsible for maintenance and that fixing and sealing the foundation will eliminate the skunk problem. Mr. Ballantyne stated that no one has determined that there is enough money to maintain the old building. Mr. Dourney stated the building is 300 years old and is worth it.

Roger Mezitt, Historical Commission, stated the Commission is looking at the maintenance and funding of this and other buildings, including the old railroad station and gatehouse at the Whitehall Reservoir dam. He stated they are working on cost projections and working on getting funding. He stated that funds can be obtained from the CPA and other ways. Mr. Coolidge noted that CPA funds can't be used for maintenance.

It was moved and seconded to determine that the proposed plan met the criteria in the Senior Housing Development bylaw. The vote on the motion was unanimous.

Mr. Goncalves moved to approve the change to the concept plan and special permit with the following conditions:

1. There shall be no new buildings located within 100 feet of Lumber St.
2. There shall be a maximum number of 47 units within the development, all outside the 100 ft. setback from Lumber St.
3. The old house to be conveyed to the Historical Commission and which is currently part of Deerfield Estates shall be connected to a water and sewer system as originally shown on the plan within the development, or individual systems on the building lot, whether it is located on the development property or not. The house shall also be provided with electric service.
4. The Site Plan amendment application shall be accompanied by the following documentation.
 - A. Written approval from the Board of Health indicating that the on-site septic system can accommodate the changes, including the old house;
 - B. Written approval from the DEP indicating that the on-site well can accommodate the additional usage, including the old house;
 - C. Information sufficient for the Board's engineer to determine whether there will be additional flows to the stormwater management system and if so, that it can handle the additional flow. If it cannot handle the flow, modifications to the system shall be shown on the plan which will accommodate the change.
 - D. If the property lines of the Senior Housing Development will be modified by the conveyance of land to the Historical Commission, the new lines shall be shown on the plan. Information indicating compliance with provisions of the Senior Housing Bylaw with the deletion of the land shall be submitted.
5. A detailed landscape plan shall be submitted with the Site Plan.

The motion was seconded. The vote on the motion was 5 in favor (Aghababian, Dourney, Goncalves, Coolidge, Wright) and 3 opposed (Abate, Altamura, Ballantyne). The motion failed due to lack of a 2/3 vote of the Board membership required by MGL c.40A sec. 9.

Ms. Altamura stated she would vote in favor of the changes, but wants to see them on a plan first and would prefer that the hearing be continued so that a revised plan can be submitted. Mr. Aghababian noted that the box on the site the applicant is working in is small, so there can only be so many configurations. The issue was discussed further.

The Board voted unanimously to continue the hearing to December 12, 2005 at 7:00 PM.

**3. Public Hearing – Sudbury River Townhouses – Cedar St. Ext. & Lincoln St. –
Amendment to Garden Apartment Site Plan**

Jose Martins, applicant, Brian Levey, attorney, and Dan Feeney, engineer, appeared before the Board. Mr. Levey stated they are requesting an amendment to the Garden Apartment Site Plan approval for Sudbury River Townhouses. He stated that after making its decision, members of the Board visited the site and determined that the sight distance was adequate so there is no need for condition #24 to remain as is. It was noted that condition #24 requires an agreement with the abutter (Grasso) in order to cut trees for sight distance on their property.

Mr. Ballantyne referred to pending litigation and asked if there has been an agreement between the Grassos and Mr. Martins. Mr. Abate replied no. Mr. Coolidge asked if they had tried to reach an agreement. Mr. Levey replied yes.

Debbie Batog, attorney representing Peter and Allison Grasso, stated the Grassos concerns have been included in the Board's decisions as conditions, not on the plans. She stated there was a site visit today to look at that the area, including the screening of their property. She stated she has questions as to the propriety of the Board changing its decision while it is under appeal. She stated she defers to the advice of Town Counsel Larry Faiman regarding this issue.

Mr. Abate stated that both he and Ms. Lazarus had spoken to Mr. Faiman today and he has no problem with the Board amending its decision this evening.

Ms. Batog stated that she questions whether the Town actually owns the Cedar St. Ext. road layout, and distributed copies of the taking in the 1940's. She stated it appears to be an easement, not a fee ownership. She stated that the easement may not allow the tree removal. She stated that the stakes on the site indicating the road location are not from an instrument survey, and are not necessarily referenced to the taking plan.

Mr. Aghababian stated this seems to be a simple issue for the Planning Board, and it doesn't need to act on this. He stated that all the Board cares about is sight distance. He stated that if the sight distance requires the cutting of trees on the Grasso property, then it needs to make sure there is an agreement to do that. He stated if they can't work that out, then the Board will have to deal with that later.

Mr. Coolidge stated the developer should work with the neighbors. Mr. Abate stated he doesn't think the three trees marked make any difference to the sight distance at all, after visiting the area. He stated he doesn't think they need to be removed, and one could clearly see the cars coming down the road with them there. He stated the trees do not have any vegetation low to the ground that block sight distance. Ms. Wright noted that when she visited the area and discussed the three trees, it was thought that that removing those trees could make the sight distance better, but it isn't bad the way it is now. She stated that low brush is a bigger issue, and the Grassos could keep the brush cut down.

Mr. Levey stated that the Board's Site Plan decision states that no construction can start until there is a written agreement, whether or not the sight distance is actually adequate the way it is. He stated that even without condition #24, the town is protected because the developer will have

to provide adequate sight distance. He stated that if it is correct that it isn't town land, the developer will still need permission to remove the trees. He stated that changing the condition will help in reaching a resolution to this issue.

Ms. Batog stated the Board should find that the sight distance is adequate if it eliminates the condition.

Mr. Martins stated that three Board members visited the site before today and asked if they were comfortable with the sight distance then. Ms. Wright stated she was comfortable with it, but felt that removal of a few trees would make it a little better. She stated she didn't really want all three trees to come down.

Ms. Batog stated the Board should make the finding that the sight distance is adequate.

Mr. Aghababian stated that when the Board typically approves a plan, it has something before it. In response to a question, Ms. Lazarus read an excerpt from a report of Fay, Spofford & Thorndike (FST) regarding sight distance. Mr. Goncalves asked if the sight distance is ok with zero clearing, and the Board should have FST verify that.

Mr. Abate stated that in his conversation with Mr. Faiman today, he stated that the Grassos claim had no merit.

Tom Gaston, 71 Wedgewood Dr., stated that the road is in the same location as it was for the previous subdivision plan, Sudbury River Estates, and the Grassos didn't appeal that after a lengthy hearing process.

Ms. Batog stated that her clients thought the Hubley's house would stay, so the road was in that location because of it, and now the road location is different.

Mr. Gaston disagreed.

Mr. Abate stated the Board should eliminate the condition, noting there was a site walk and the developer has reached out and done all he could. He stated the Grassos were at all of the hearings and no one said there was no agreement. He stated the Board shouldn't hold this up any more.

Allison Grasso, 50 Cedar St. Ext., stated she did say she was opposed and was told that she didn't have a choice in the road location.

Ms. Altamura stated she remembers the Grassos saying there was no agreement.

Mr. Martins stated he started talking to Peter Grasso three years ago about a buffer for their property. He stated about 1 ½ months ago Mr. Grasso said they were close to an agreement regarding screening with a combination of trees and cash. He stated that now he is not returning his calls or talking to him. He stated that all of his conversations were with Mr. Grasso, who seemed willing to agree but now he has disappeared. He stated he doesn't want the Board to

think there wasn't an agreement, and he felt confident they were close to finalizing it at the public hearing.

Ms. Batog stated the discussions were with regard to planting and screening, not tree removal.

Mr. Goncalves stated the agreement is between the two parties, not the Planning Board. He stated the Board needs to make a determination about the sight distance at the present time, based on no tree cutting. Ms. Wright asked about mitigation and if the Town could use convex mirrors like they use in other towns. Mr. Coolidge asked if the sight distance is laid out on a plan and if it could be forwarded to FST for review. He stated that the sight distance area doesn't have to be cleared; it can be interrupted, as is typical in Hopkinton. It was noted that FST had reviewed a plan during the hearing process.

Mr. Levey suggested removing the first half of condition #24 and leaving the rest, which will remove the requirement for an agreement but require that adequate sight distance be provided. Mr. Martins stated that would at least let them start work while the appeal is pending. Mr. Levey stated it would leave the Planning Board in control of sight distance.

Mr. Ballantyne moved to delete the first section of condition #24, which would then begin with the words "Whether the trees..", add that it is pending review by FST, then the Board will determine whether it is adequate. Ms. Wright stated the Board should wait before doing this. Mr. Levey stated the change will move the litigation along. Ms. Batog stated it is not the Board's role to interfere in this. It was noted that the Board is also being sued. The motion was not seconded.

Mr. Goncalves moved to ask FST to review the sight distance in the field and continue the public hearing so the Board can review their comments. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion. The Board voted unanimously to continue the public hearing to January 9, 2006 at 9:00 PM.

4. Continued Public Hearing – Community Covenant Church – 2 West Elm St. – Site Plan Review

Mary Hubbe, Matt Overholt, Bruce Johnson, and Shawn McGuinness representing the Community Covenant Church appeared before the Board. It was stated that Ms. McGuinness is the architect for the project. Ms. Hubbe stated the addition needed a variance, which was rejected by the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA). She stated they then reworked the building on the site, which was accepted by the ZBA a few weeks ago. She showed the Board the revised plan for the addition, noting it will have an additional 80 sq. ft. but the total area will still be less than 3,000 sq. ft.

Ms. McGuinness stated it will now be 28 feet back from the lot line instead of 13 feet as shown before. She described the building.

Mary Pratt, 102 Fruit St., asked why the variance was held up. Ms. Altamura stated there were concerns about safety and sight distance.

Ms. Altamura asked if the trees along West Elm St. would still be removed, and Ms. Hubbe replied that one might be removed, but they will try to save it if they can.

The Board voted 7 in favor, with Mr. Dourney abstaining, to find that the Site Plan approval criteria are met and approve the Site Plan as submitted.

5. Continued Public Hearing – E. L. Harvey & Sons – Materials Recovery & Recycling Facility – Wood St. – Site Plan Review

The Board stated it had received a request from the applicant to continue the public hearing. The Board voted unanimously to continue the hearing to December 12, 2005 at 7:30 PM.

6. 81-P Plan – 28 & 30 North Mill St. – Nealon

Christian Nealon, owner, stated that some time ago the Board had endorsed an 81-P plan to create the two lots, and they have since gone to the ZBA to get the lot approved. He stated the 81-P plan had a “future lot line” indicated on it, and the ZBA has asked them to actually create that lot now. He noted that the old barn would be transferred from one lot to the other. It was stated there would be no change to the frontage of the lots.

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

7. Fieldstone Farm – Wood St.

The Board reviewed plans for a future MGL c. 40B filing for the Quitt property on Wood St., sent to the Board of Selectmen by the Mass. Housing Finance Agency for comment. Mr. Goncalves stated this area used to be a town dump, and the report submitted says a 21E was done and refers to State “guidelines”. He stated the State has more than guidelines, and if there has been a release, it should be reported to DEP.

Mr. Coolidge stated the applicant came to a Housing Committee meeting, and said that the area was ideal and they would proceed with the application. He stated there were issues with the dump, noting that 50 gallon drums and other things have been seen there in the past.

Ms. Altamura stated she knows there is still trash there from people who have walked the area over the years. She stated she has trouble with the way the proposed development surrounds the Wallace home. She stated it is a horrible plan, especially the size and scale of buildings, massing, and there are no buildings in Town this tall. She stated the mass needs to be broken up, scaled down, and units scattered around the site instead. She stated the design is horrible, thoughtless, and they have no right to treat an abutter like that.

Mr. Coolidge stated there are buildings in the wetland buffer also. Ms. Altamura stated it is obvious the people don’t care about Hopkinton, it is an embarrassment, and she has never seen a worse plan. Mr. Coolidge stated there needs to be more delineation of the dump site and wetlands. Ms. Altamura states she hopes the Selectmen are very vocal about this type of plan.

Mrs. Pratt stated the DPW Advisory Committee has told them there is no access to town sewer at this site and they can’t guarantee town water, with the three other 40B projects coming on line.

She stated the Town is under a DEP water withdrawal permit, and is pumping that amount already.

Mr. Goncalves referred to a recent report that the State believes that communities in Metrowest are pumping too much water right now. He stated that two State agencies are fighting each other over this, with DHCD promoting housing and provision of town water, and DEP setting the withdrawal limits. He stated if they can't use Town water, where will the water come from?

The Board stated that the project is too dense, not appropriate for the property, has not been reviewed by the Design Review Board, does not make environmental sense, and is intrusive to the neighborhood.

Mr. Dourney stated it will create more affordable units. Mrs. Pratt stated that 75% of the units will be market rate and added to the base number of housing units, doing little with respect to the Town's overall percentage of affordable units.

The Board stated that there should be an adequate environmental assessment of the property and the dump is subject to State review, and the design does not reflect the rural feel of the town with four buildings of 3 stories each. The Board stated that it is disappointed that someone has created a design like this for the town, and it shows no thought.

Cobi Wallace, 91 Wood St., stated that this plan has caused them a lot of stress, and there is little they can do about it. She stated that the proponent made them an offer to move, but there would be nowhere to go. She stated if they bought her house it would be demolished, and it would be a shame to demolish an existing affordable home to create other ones. She stated they will have no privacy, as they only have about 50 feet of rear yard depth and there will be a road beyond that. She stated it would be the end of their ability to enjoy their property, and it would be located in the interior of a loop road on all sides.

Mrs. Pratt stated the DPW Advisory Committee Minutes in the past should include a discussion of the property when the Town was looking to buy it to expand the DPW. She stated the owner didn't allow the Town to do the 21E study on the property, only look at wetlands boundaries.

The Board decided to send a letter summarizing their comments.

8. Master Plan

Muriel Kramer, Chairman, Master Plan Committee, joined the Board. Other members of the Master Plan Committee present were: Trish Perry, Russ Greve, Gail Fallon, Carol DeVeuve, and Chris Nation. Ms. Kramer stated they have not updated the daft since the last meeting, and they intend to add a Goals and Implementation section later. She stated the Committee needs to synthesize all of the sections and speak to the vision. She stated they don't want an "impediment driven" document.

Mr. Ballantyne stated that when he reviewed it, there was a lot of duplication and it needs to be simplified. He stated the definitions of terms should be in the appendix, and suggested summarizing the goals in the first 5 or 6 pages. He suggested trying to make it a 10 page

document, then expanding it. He suggested tying the statistics and charts more to the text or summarize them in the text and putting the data in an appendix. He recommended including an executive summary.

Mr. Abate suggested moving the goals from the end of each section to the beginning and limiting each section to 2 or 3 concise pages. He stated that in reviewing the content, there was a lot about resources, land, and preserving rural character, and there should be more about how to build the revenue base to support the infrastructure. He stated that more about development should be sprinkled throughout the document, and more of it should focus on the Town as a business instead of the Town as a state park.

Mr. Aghababian stated there is a conflict in the town between rural character and economic development which is brought out in the Plan. He stated the Town needs to plan and help get to the resolution.

Ms. Kramer stated they have focused on land use and are trying to reflect what a lot of people have said. She stated they need more input from the Board.

Ms. Wright noted that this will be a Planning Board document, and it needs to look at what it says and what the follow-up actions on the part of the Board will be. She stated the document needs to be useable and workable. She stated there are some conflicts between different sections because they were written by different people. She stated she is concerned about the Civic Engagement section, and the Town needs to act instead of just continuing to talk about doing things. She stated that officials need to take on the work, not just continue to have focus groups. She stated there needs to be a balance between the economic development and environmental issues. She stated the Planning Board will be responsible for implementing the plan, and it needs to make sure it can do that.

Mr. Goncalves stated there needs to be a major issues section with these dilemmas, then accomplishments and goals.

Mr. Abate suggested organizing the document into quadrants based on issues so it is balanced.

Mr. Dourney stated that in review of the data, residents aren't saying that the rural character is the most important thing. He stated they are saying that downtown revitalization is important. He stated that people are tired of going to Milford to spend their money. He suggested an economic zone in the Rt. 495/West Main St. area and increasing its size and/or changing the uses allowed there. He stated that this kind of thing is lacking in the plan. He stated that economic development is not just about protecting lakes, it is more than that. He stated he encourages Planning Board members to attend Master Plan Committee meetings, as he doesn't think the Board's documents reflects the Town's opinions. He stated the direction of the Master Plan Committee is not unbiased and is not healthy.

Mr. Aghababian stated the Board struggles to approve projects that "comply" with the Master Plan, when it is written subjectively so that it can be read in a number of ways. He asked if its recommendations can be more specific.

Ms. Kramer stated the Committee set out at the beginning to take in information and set their personal biases aside. She stated that most people understand the complexities but there aren't a lot of ideas about how to address them. She asked if there should be fewer goals. She stated that the Committee needs comments that are specific to the goals.

Mrs. Pratt stated she hopes the document will be ready for the 2006 annual town meeting. She stated the Plan is worthless unless the Town follows it up with zoning changes, etc.

Ms. Wright stated the Historical section needs more about the ways to build historic preservation into land use laws and zoning.

Mr. Abate suggested holding a joint meeting to go through the document. Ms. Kramer stated the Committee will meet next on December 13.

Ms. Wright stated the Civic Engagement section could be in the appendix and appears heavy handed.

Ms. Perry stated the civic engagement tool is a classic part of master plans, and it shouldn't be considered an edict for going forward. She stated that use of these processes raises the complexities of issues so it is educational for voters. She stated they can change the wording, but the civic engagement processes are underlying premises that have been proven elsewhere.

Ms. Kramer stated that if people could identify which charts and graphs they use regularly, it would be important to know, so they can tell which to eliminate.

9. Administrative Business

Nathaniel Wyman Homestead – The Board reviewed a letter from the developer requesting the release of the remaining performance guarantee funds. The Board noted that all of the work had been completed, but the open space had not yet been conveyed to the Town. The Board voted unanimously to send a letter stating that it would authorize release of the funds once the open space is conveyed.

Greyhound Friends – The Board voted unanimously to authorize the release of funds held for the Greyhound Friends site plan review completed in 2002.

Minutes - The Board voted unanimously to approve the Minutes of February 25, 1991. The Board voted unanimously to approve the Minutes of November 14, 2005.

Finance - The Board discussed requesting a reserve fund transfer to cover the costs for someone to take Minutes at Planning Board meetings. The Board voted unanimously to submit the request.

Zoning Advisory Committee – The Board voted 6 in favor, with Mr. Ballantyne and Mr. Dourney opposed, to appoint Nancy Peters to the Zoning Advisory Committee as the Board of Health representative.

Scenic Road - Mr. Coolidge brought to the attention a recent widening of Pond St. when it was paved. It was noted that Pond St. is a designated scenic road.

Land Use Study Committee – Mr. Coolidge stated that the Committee’s contract with Community Opportunities Group has a few more hours in it, and asked the Planning Board if it would fund an additional 10 hours. The Board stated it would do that.

Adjourned: 10:15 PM

Elaine C. Lazarus, Planning Director

Approved: December 12, 2005