

HOPKINTON PLANNING BOARD

Monday, September 24, 2007 7:30 P.M.
Hopkinton Town Hall

MINUTES

PRESENT: Mark Abate, Chairman, R.J. Dourney, 1st Vice-Chairman, Joe Markey, 2nd Vice-Chairman, Sandy K. Altamura, John H. Coolidge, Claire Wright, Carol DeVeuve, Ken Weismantel

..... Elaine Lazarus, Planning Director
.....Cobi Wallace, Administrative Assistant

1. Public Hearing – Drowne Family Subdivision/Leon Lane – Definitive Subdivision Plan – Saddle Hill Rd.

Tim Paris, Connorstone Engineering, engineer, appeared before the Board on behalf of Drowne Family Trust, applicant. Mr. Abate noted that Mr. Ballantyne is absent tonight and Mr. Dourney will be delayed so that the number of Board members eligible to vote has been reduced to 7. Mr. Paris stated he understands but it makes sense to proceed with the public hearing process. He stated that most of the Board is familiar with the plan from the previous submittal, and described the proposal. Mr. Paris stated that the site is located on Saddle Hill Rd. across from Equestrian Dr. and 5 new lots are proposed on a dead-end street just under 690 ft. long. He stated the lots are intended for the children of the 5 families of this generation so that they can continue living in Hopkinton. Mr. Paris stated the size of the parcel is a little less than 10 acres so there is no requirement for a cluster subdivision application but the land does not lend itself to cluster development anyway due to the amount of wetlands. He noted they are asking for waivers from full-scale roadway construction, pavement width and sub-surface drainage which will be handled using Low Impact Development (LID) techniques with runoff passing through vegetated swales before it goes into the wetlands. Mr. Paris stated there will be a detention basin for additional treatment of the runoff before it discharges into the swamp. He noted it is a huge wetland area extending eastward toward to Rt. 85. He stated they located areas for the septic systems and the homes will be serviced by individual wells. He stated he is looking for a waiver to allow a long dead-end street which is approximately 200 ft. longer than the 500 ft. maximum allowed.

Mr. Abate asked about the number of conventional subdivisions in Town with cul-de-sacs in excess of 500 ft. Ms. Lazarus stated that the Town may have a few here and there but they were approved a long time ago.

Mr. Paris stated they have three separate justifications for a long dead-end street: (1) The subject parcel is backland with a single access point between existing homes resulting in the loss of approximately 250 ft. of new roadway for usable frontage; (2) With the shorter roadway design, runoff would go directly into the detention basin while a longer road will allow an additional treatment step in the form of a drop inlet; (3) Mr. Paris stated they have looked at loop road and

through road configurations but there is no other feasible access point because the site is bordered by developed lots, State land and wetlands. Mr. Paris stated the applicant would like the Board to consider these reasons for allowing a long dead-end street. He stated that Fay, Spofford & Thorndike (FST) in its most recent review letter has a few more concerns but recommends that they be addressed with the Board. Mr. Paris stated he has created a sightline distance plan and the access point is in a good area. He noted that there are a few trees that have to be removed including one in the middle of the roadway and a couple more that are potentially in the way. Mr. Paris stated it will be better to look at it in the field when the roadway is in. Ms. Altamura asked what the results are for sight distance, and Mr. Paris indicated there is 400 ft. in each direction measured from 15 ft. back. Mr. Paris referred to FST's comment regarding the turnaround area. He stated they have increased the size of the circle from 40 to 42 ft because 40 ft. would be only marginally acceptable for an SU-30 vehicle. Mr. Paris stated that the Fire Department did not express concern when it was 40 ft. but FST recommends they discuss the issue with them. Mr. Paris noted that fire protection was a major concern with the previous application but that the Fire Chief has indicated that sprinkler systems for the homes would be satisfactory instead of a fire cistern. Mr. Paris referred to FST's comments regarding hydraulic calculations and this has been addressed in their opinion. He concluded that FST's technical comments have been mostly addressed but the biggest issue is the length of the road.

Ms. Wright asked about the frontage for Lots 2 and 3, and Mr. Paris indicated that both have a little more than the minimum 200 ft. required. Mr. Abate asked where the 500 ft. mark is on the road. Mr. Paris showed the location on the plan and stated that if the road was 500 ft. long they would only be able to get 2 lots, 3 at the most or possibly 4 with a larger cul-de-sac. Ms. Wright stated she is now more comfortable with the fire protection provisions but has concerns regarding stormwater management. She added that she is glad to see that the road will be paved. She stated that the Board is looking at ways to justify the long dead-end street and identify exceptional circumstances. She stated that she is trying to think creatively and suggested possibly using "a reverse paper street" idea where there is a turnaround at the 500 ft. mark but the road actually extends further on paper. Mr. Paris referred to projects done in neighboring Southborough where they allow longer dead-end streets utilizing temporary easements and paper streets. Ms. Altamura stated this would essentially allow driveways to be built. Mr. Paris noted that everything would look the same on the ground but they would have frontage on a paper street. Ms. Lazarus stated the plan shows a swale where the turnaround would be and also asked about the impact on Lot 4. She stated she is concerned about the stormwater being directed elsewhere.

Ms. Altamura stated she does not want to lead the applicant down the wrong path but the length of the road is a major hurdle. Ms. Wright stated she feels they should approve the plan. Mr. Coolidge stated that the Board has to identify exceptional circumstances in order to allow the dead-end street. He stated the subdivision parcel is not big enough for an Open Space and Landscape Preservation Development (OSLPD) subdivision and asked about the possibility of the Family Trust contributing some of the adjacent land it owns. Mr. Paris stated the adjacent parcel was separated off because of the amount of wetland and it is not possible to do a cluster development. Mr. Coolidge stated that this plan could set a precedent and might open up a thousand parcels just like this in Town. Ms. Wright referred to a back lot article that was

defeated at town meeting a few years ago, noting that people do not like back lot development. The Board discussed the requirements under the OSLPD bylaw.

Ms. Altamura stated she does not see any other way to do this than the way proposed.

Nancy Mercer, 62 Saddle Hill Rd., Drowne Family Trust, applicant, stated she does not see how they could shorten the cul-de-sac and get the desired number of lots.

Dan Mercer, 62 Saddle Hill Rd, Drowne Family Trust, applicant, stated they would like to be able to shorten the road but there is not enough good land to accommodate the homes.

Mr. Weismantel stated is he looking for a solution and asked if the exceptional circumstance could be the donation of land for open space. Ms. Altamura noted that Lots 2 and 3 back up to State owned land (Hopkinton State Park). Mr. Mercer stated that there are some nice wildlife areas out there.

The Board discussed the concept of family subdivisions, and Mr. Coolidge stated it was considered a way for land-rich/cash-poor families to stay in Town and road maintenance would not be a problem among family members. He added there are a number of family subdivisions in Town and they were approved in good faith as there is no control over ownership after approval. Mr. Coolidge stated that donating land to the State, the Land Trust or the Town might be considered an exceptional circumstance. Mr. Markey stated this should be spelled out carefully so that it would not open up other properties for development. Ms. Lazarus referred to the Comeau subdivision (extension of Benson Rd.) where one lot was donated to the Hopkinton Area Land Trust (HALT). Mr. Abate asked if it would compromise the OSLPD bylaw and Mr. Coolidge stated it would not as the donation would be an outright gift. Mr. Mercer stated they would be willing to donate the land, noting it is about 12 acres.

Mr. Paris stated that FST's calculation of the road length is different than Connorstone's, and Ms. Lazarus stated that the method of measuring the length of a cul-de-sac is the issue, and it was changed in the past as there was a problem with people creating very large circles to create frontage.

Ms. Wright asked whether the family should talk over a donation first before agreeing to something. Ms. Mercer noted that it is what they wanted to do in the very beginning. Mr. Coolidge stated that the Open Space Preservation Commission would certainly be willing to accept the land. Other entities that may be interested were noted.

David Goldman, 20 Fruit St., President, HALT, asked if the family has contacted the Massachusetts Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) to see if they are interested in a land swap. Mr. Coolidge stated there may be restrictions on the land and Ms. Altamura stated that it could take a long time. Mr. Paris stated that they still need the road length to get the number of lots they want.

Mr. Abate asked if they should continue the hearing and ask the applicants to provide another schematic. Mr. Coolidge stated that it appears the applicant is willing to donate land to the State

or some other entity in exchange for waivers from the Subdivision Rules and Regulations. Mr. Coolidge stated they could end the pavement at 500 ft., and Ms. Altamura cautioned not to be too creative so that the Board would get hurt later.

Mr. Weismantel stated the Board should grant the waiver for the long dead-end road and Ms. Altamura agreed as it would get the proposal over an important hurdle. Mr. Weismantel stated he does not like back lots and is not really in favor of family subdivisions but feels approval of the long dead-end road in this case will not set a precedent although there are other issues regarding this proposal he would like to talk about.

Mr. Dourney arrived at this time.

Mr. Coolidge stated that the main issue is the length of the road. Mr. Abate stated that he is concerned about setting a precedent and would not be in favor of granting the waiver. Ms. DeVeuve referred to Mr. Coolidge's statement regarding the number of similar situations in Town. Mr. Coolidge stated he does not know how many of those property owners would be willing to donate land and the Board is setting a high bar here. He stated that a land donation here would open up a wildlife corridor and DCR would like it. Mr. Abate stated he is approaching it from a different perspective and feels that it would be beneficial for the family to do this. He noted it appears to be a case of quid pro quo and the family will not have to pay taxes on the land any more. Mr. Markey stated he is uncomfortable with the idea not knowing the number of parcels like this. Ms. DeVeuve asked whether this would accomplish what the OSLPD bylaw is looking for in a different way. Mr. Abate stated he feels the Town should continue collecting the taxes on the land and Mr. Weismantel stated the Town probably is not giving up a lot of tax revenue in this case.

Mr. Weismantel suggested a non-binding straw poll. Ms. Wright stated she is in favor of a land donation but would prefer a shorter road. Ms. DeVeuve stated she does not have a problem with an outright land donation but would like to see the road moved back a little. Mr. Paris noted that they could possibly shorten the road by 150 ft. but Mr. Coolidge questioned whether Lot 4 would then be actually usable. Mr. Weismantel stated he is in favor. Ms. Altamura stated she is in favor. Mr. Markey stated he is ok with the idea as long as the conditions can be properly articulated in order to prevent other property owners from doing this. Ms. Wright asked about setting up a mechanism for the LID stormwater management system so that it is properly maintained. She referred to Board of Health concerns about mosquitoes and stated she needs to feel comfortable with a mechanism other than someone's word as conditions change over time in these developments and she wants to make sure the system is properly maintained.

Mr. Weismantel stated he does not like back lots but can live with this development and is willing to approve most of the waivers requested. He stated that the road has to be paved from day one, as a gravel road for 5 homes will be a mess. He stated he is open to phasing and stated the Town plows most of the roads even if they are not accepted. He stated he is fine with the drainage system. Mr. Weismantel noted that this application has been delayed enough and he is ready to go forward. He expressed concern about tree removal on Saddle Hill Rd. and wants to look at it when the road is in. He noted that the Board may want to require replacement trees to

be placed along adjacent property and this would be a consideration for some large trees that might have to come down.

Mr. Abate noted he would like to see the opinion of the Board of Health regarding the water supply and wants to make sure that it is adequate as the individual wells will also be the water source for the sprinkler systems. Mr. Markey referred to the waiver request regarding an environmental analysis. He noted it is a small subdivision with a lot of assumptions being made regarding LID and feels an environmental analysis should be submitted. Mr. Coolidge stated that the development will not be built for a number of years and does not like to see a paved road sitting there for 10 years. He suggested that the road should be built to binder coat before the first building permit is issued with the requirement for the final pavement before the occupancy permit.

The Board voted unanimously to continue the public hearing to Monday, October 15, 2007 at 7:45 P.M.

Mr. Markey stepped off the Board at this time.

2. Hopkinton Square, West Main St./South St. – Site Plan Review

Peter Markarian and Chuck Joseph, CJPM Development LLC, applicants, appeared before the Board.

Mr. Abate stated that the public hearing regarding this proposal is closed and the Board will only take questions for the sake of clarification. Mr. Coolidge stated he will not be able to vote as he did not attend all public hearings. Mr. Abate stated that the Board appears to be ready for a vote.

Ms. Wright referred to the fence requested by EMC Corporation for screening the project from their property at 42 South St. She noted that Mr. Dourney has written a letter recommending that the Board include this as a requirement and that the applicant has now agreed to it. She stated she is totally in favor of being a good neighbor but does not see the sense of a gesture that accomplishes nothing. She stated she visited the area today and the situation could probably be addressed by a chain-link fence with slats like the one at Cumberland Farms and the Board could revisit the issue once the project is underway. She added that based on what other Board members have seen she has a hard time understanding what this will accomplish. Mr. Abate asked about the possibility of the applicant spending money on traffic mitigation instead of the fence and Ms. Wright stated that it is a different issue with a lot of disagreement. Mr. Dourney stated he respects EMC's request and applauds the applicant's response and that is how neighbors should work together. Ms. Altamura asked whether Mr. Dourney has seen the area in question and Mr. Dourney stated he has. Ms. Altamura noted they would be asking the developer to spend money needlessly and suggested that the Board could make the determination during construction when the area has been cleared. Mr. Dourney stated that the two abutters have worked this out and there is no reason to argue about this any longer. Mr. Abate stated the applicant should spend the money on something more important.

Mr. Markarian stated they have agreed to EMC's request of their own free will. He stated they are not talking about a fence along the entire area but it will take care of the immediate view

shed and they are not looking for any tradeoff with respect to traffic mitigation. He stated it has been worked out.

Mr. Abate asked if all Board members have seen the draft decision. Mr. Weismantel stated a couple of pages have to be changed to reflect the screening agreement reached between the two parties. Mr. Weismantel asked about a requirement for an easement along West Main St. for future road widening. It was noted that if the Town wishes to widen the road in the future, it could obtain ownership or an easement then, since no one knows what width might be appropriate.

Mr. Weismantel moved to determine that the approval criteria contained in the Site Plan Review bylaw have been met. Ms. Altamura seconded the motion, and the Board voted 6 in favor with 1 abstention (Coolidge) on the motion.

Mr. Weismantel moved to approve the site plan for Hopkinton Square with conditions, Ms. Altamura seconded the motion, and the Board voted 6 in favor with 1 abstention (Coolidge) to approve the site plan with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant has noted that the exterior elevation drawings of the buildings may be modified, depending on the needs of individual tenants. As these changes are developed, the Applicant shall review them with the Design Review Board prior to the commencement of construction of those items. The Board expects that consistency with the overall design concept will be maintained.
2. In response to the reports dated June 21, 2007, August 16, 2007, September 7, 2007 and September 20, 2007 from FST and discussions with FST and the Planning Board, several modifications were made to the submitted plans. A complete set of plans revised in accordance with this approval and discussed/reviewed at the public hearings shall be submitted to the Planning Board for review by FST and the Planning Department to ensure that all items are included in this final design plan. Once it is determined that the plans are complete, three full sets shall be provided to the Planning Board and one full set shall be provided to the Director of Municipal Inspections prior to the commencement of construction. The plan set shall also include erosion and sedimentation control plans to be implemented during construction.
3. The Director of Municipal Inspections inspects site plans under construction for compliance with the approved Site Plan. If the Director of Municipal Inspections determines at any time before or during construction that a registered professional engineer or other such outside professional is required to assist with the inspections of the stormwater management system or other component of the Site Plan, the Applicant shall be responsible for the cost of those inspections.
4. FST recommended in its memo dated September 7, 2007 that updated traffic counts be taken at the West Main St./South St. intersection after the site is 75% occupied or one year after initial occupancy, whichever occurs first, and used to develop revised signal timing plans. The Planning Board so requires, with the Applicant responsible for the cost of the traffic

counts and development of revised signal timing plans if required. The Applicant shall notify the Planning Board and the Hopkinton Department of Public Works prior to the commencement of the traffic counts, so that this may be coordinated with any similar work expected or ongoing at that time.

5. Recommendations contained in 8.C.3. and 8.F.2. of FST’s September 7, 2007 memo regarding traffic shall be incorporated into the final design plan, as follows:

8.C.3. - West Main St./South St. - FST concurs that adding a second eastbound through lane and installing a “do not block driveway sign” would minimize the impact of queues at the South Street intersection during the morning peak. However, FST also agrees with the potential safety issue pointed out by the Chief of Police. Considering the tradeoff between increased queue storage and safety, it is FST’s recommendation that the extension of the two eastbound through lanes end approximately 50 feet east of the site drive. It is also recommended that the improvements include increasing the length of the eastbound right turn lane as a means of further reducing queues.

8.F.2. – West Main St./Site Driveway – After careful consideration of the various design options that could be pursued, FST believes that the latest revised plan, dated August 6, 2007, depicting two westbound lanes for 200 feet with a 330 foot merge taper is the preferred concept with the following recommendations to be included in a Final Design Plan:

- Increase the length of two westbound lanes to 250 feet, a potential one car length increase to the back of queue.
- Provide a uniform merge taper from two to one westbound lane over a length of 330 feet.
- Provide an 11 foot wide westbound left turn lane with at least 100 feet of storage and 50 foot bay taper.
- Add dashed pavement markings to enforce the merge adjacent to the bay taper.
- Increase the size of the painted island west of the site drive to at least 120 feet in length and a minimum width to shield the left turn lane of 10 feet.
- Provide an alternative median treatment to the painted island east of the site drive. It is preferred that the existing raised island be extended westward. However, to avoid impacting access to properties on the northerly side of West Main St. a flush median (i.e. scored concrete or textured pavement) may be a better treatment.

6. All exterior lighting shall be directed downward, not upward or outward, and shall not spill onto adjacent property. Light levels shall be reduced at night when the site is unoccupied to only that which is necessary for safety and security.
7. The Applicant shall revise the Site Plan to show an eight foot high solid wood fence at the top of the retaining wall on the southernmost side of the parking lot, running easterly from the west property line to a point in line with the first parking lot “peninsula” that is located approximately in line with the entrance driveway from West Main St. The Applicant shall revise the Planting Plan to include additional plantings on the slope between the fence along

the retaining wall on the south side of the property and the 42 South St. property line. The plan shall indicate that additional planting in this area shall be undertaken to fill in gaps in the understory which may result after construction.

8. All mechanical equipment shall be screened from view from the ground and from the building windows of 42 South St. Such screening shall be sufficient in the opinion of the Planning Board.
9. All dumpsters on the property shall be screened from view from the ground by a six foot tall solid fence or other effective means, adequate in the opinion of the Planning Board.
10. The Applicants stated at the public hearing that they would work with the two residential abutters across West Main St. from the development site to provide additional screening on their property. It is the Board's understanding that the Applicant and the abutters have reached an agreement relative to the provision of additional screening. The Board expects that the screening will be provided.
11. In accordance with Zoning Bylaw Sec. 210-138 the Applicant shall provide a performance guarantee in the amount of \$7,000 to the Town prior to the commencement of construction. The guarantee shall consist of a deposit of money or negotiable securities in a form selected by the Planning Board to guarantee completion of improvements to be made in compliance with the approved plans. The funds would guarantee that any unforeseen problems which arise, such as erosion and sedimentation, visual screening of abutting property, and the correction of site lighting problems, would be addressed. The funds would be held by the Town and returned to the Applicant upon completion of the project.

Mr. Markey returned to the Board at this time.

3. Design Review Board – Appointment, Alternate Member Position

Ria McNamara, 39 Oakhurst Rd., appeared before the Board. She stated she would like to be considered for the vacant position on the Design Review Board. She stated she has 20 years of experience as a broker in the retail real estate business with projects from Connecticut to Maine. She stated right now there is again new focus on “green” development, she has read more about it and would like to get more involved. Mr. Markey noted they are trying to enhance buildings with “green” technology. Ms. McNamara stated it is an education process for the developer, the Town and everybody involved in retail development. Ms. Wright stated she is a member of the Design Review Board and Ms. McNamara has the right qualifications to serve on the Board. She stated that the Design Review Board currently does not have anybody with a real estate angle. Ms. McNamara stated developers should design things that are economically feasible with a proper balance between the economy and what is right for the community. Ms. Altamura moved to appoint Ms. McNamara as an alternate member of the Design Review Board and the Board voted unanimously to appoint Ms. McNamara to a term ending 7/24/08.

4. Public Hearing – Spring Hill Estates – Spring St./Hill St.

Peter Bemis, Engineering Design Consultants/Watershed Investment, applicant/owner, appeared before the Board. Mr. Bemis stated that the Spring Hill Estates subdivision has a torturous

history starting in the 1980's with a proposal for 23 lots. He stated the subdivision was ultimately approved for 5 lots. Mr. Bemis stated that the lots were released and a bond was posted. He noted one lot was sold to an abutter and the others are not selling due to the economy. He stated that Ms. Lazarus told him about the completion date requirement and the need for an extension. Mr. Bemis stated that the DPW has installed a new water main on Spring St. and opened the street up into his subdivision road. He stated he would like the Board to extend the required completion date. He stated the open space contribution to HALT was made as promised and there are 5 lots but no houses yet. He stated he is not in a position to do anything because the economy is bad.

Mr. Bemis requested a 2-year extension. The Board voted unanimously to grant an extension of time to complete the Spring Hill Estates subdivision to December 31, 2009.

Mr. Dourney left at this time.

5. Approval Not Required/81-P Plan – 159 Saddle Hill Rd. – Lodge Corporation

Steven Greenwald, attorney, appeared before the Board. He presented an approval-not-required (ANR) plan for 159 Saddle Hill Rd. and stated it is a little different than the usual ANR applications. He described the property which has two dwellings and several other structures. He stated that under Section 81-L of the Subdivision Control Law they can split the property because the structures were there before 1954. He stated that research indicates that the buildings are from the 1920's. He added that the lots comply with zoning except for the frontage requirement.

Mr. Coolidge noted that it appears the applicant is subdividing the property into 2 lots including one that does not conform to the Town's zoning bylaws. Mr. Greenwald stated that this is not considered a subdivision under the Subdivision Control Law even though one of the lots has insufficient frontage. Ms. Lazarus stated that they would have to go to the Board of Appeals if they want to demolish the house and build a new structure, adding that it will not be considered a pre-existing nonconforming lot. Mr. Coolidge stated he is concerned about the history there and Ms. Altamura noted that the applicant is not saying anything about his future plans for the property. Mr. Lazarus stated that they can create the property line but that someone will have to go to the Board of Appeals for just about anything in the future as it will be a lot that does not comply with zoning. Ms. Wright stated the Town has a demolition delay bylaw for structures more than 75 years old but cautioned it does not prevent a structure from being demolished.

The Board voted 4 in favor (Coolidge, Altamura, Markey, Weismantel) and 3 opposed (DeVeuve, Wright, Abate) to endorse the plan as not requiring approval under the Subdivision Control Law.

6. Other Business

- **Bills**
The Board voted unanimously to approve outstanding bills.
- **Traffic Study Requirements**
It was noted that the need for detailed traffic study requirements was brought to the Planning Board's attention by the Zoning Advisory Committee (ZAC). Ms. Lazarus noted that a

traffic “bylaw” has been a ZAC work program/agenda item for a while but that it is probably not legal. She stated it would be good to specify what a traffic study should contain. She noted it had been suggested that the Town do the traffic studies, but they have to be done up front and she does not know if the Town would want its engineer to work with the applicant that closely.

Mary Pratt, 102 Fruit St., member of the Board of Selectmen but speaking as an individual, referred to a project like Hopkinton Square and stated that the Town of Framingham has a bylaw that requires money for mitigation, and Ms. Lazarus stated that it is not legal. Ms. DeVeuve noted it is important to look for mitigation and Ms. Lazarus stated the Town can only require mitigation for items directly related to the project. Ms. Altamura stated that the Board’s first experience with traffic studies was when Lodge came in with their plans for Saddle Hill Rd. and that they did not reflect actual conditions because of road closings and weather conditions. She added that there should be timing requirements for traffic studies. Ms. DeVeuve asked if there is a way to quantify what the monetary impact is going to be. Ms. Pratt stated that EMC contributed to the reconstruction of the West Main St./South St. intersection which is now going to deteriorate as a result of the Hopkinton Square project and asked who is going to pay for that. Mr. Markey stated that they should always ask for mitigation. Ms. Lazarus noted that developers expect to be asked. Ms. Altamura asked how surrounding towns gauge their mitigation. Ms. Lazarus noted that it cannot be a formula based impact fee as it would be considered a tax. Ms. Lazarus stated that if a new street light is required as a result of a new development, then the applicant would have to pay for the whole thing. She added that EMC’s development had to go through a MEPA process which required the traffic improvements and it will be the same with Boulder Capital. Ms. Altamura asked how the Town will get involved and Ms. Lazarus stated that there will be a lot of studies and reports done and the Town will participate in that process. Ms. Altamura brought up the issue of a new school. Ms. Pratt stated that the School Committee claims there will be no need for a new school. Mr. Markey stated the Town should be asking for more mitigation for all kinds of projects. Ms. Lazarus stated the Town has to be specific and cannot use the mitigation money to raise revenue. Ms. Altamura stated that impact is accumulative. Mr. Weismantel stated that early in his career he did some traffic studies and it is amazing how much traffic a 2-lane road can take.

Muriel Kramer, 39 North St., member of the Board of Selectmen but speaking as an individual, stated that increased traffic results in increased maintenance and it is not just those additional 10 cars on the road. She stated snow removal is expensive. She stated that there should be a negotiation process where perhaps the Town would not get a new traffic light but an artificial turf playing field as mitigation, for example. She noted that this is done successfully in other places. Ms. Wright noted that the Town has to look at this against the backdrop of a more business-friendly climate. She added the Town is competing with other towns and she wants to make sure the bar is not set too high. Ms. Kramer stated it has to be a give and take process. Mr. Abate stated that the Board has to tell applicants it is looking for mitigation and they will need to be prepared to offer something. Ms. DeVeuve referred to the Rockwood Meadows proposal where the applicant showed willingness to make a financial contribution toward a traffic light.

- Minutes - The Board voted to approve the Minutes of September 10, 2007 (6 in favor, one abstention (Coolidge)).
- Mr. Weismantel distributed a copy of the Zoning Advisory Committee (ZAC) work program and referred to the last meeting on September 11. He stated the Public Forum was a success and they received a good report from Sasaki Associates. Ms. Altamura referred to the proposal regarding hours of operation for trucks. She stated the Police Chief has indicated he will come to a ZAC meeting and provide some language. Mr. Weismantel asked the Planning Board to monitor ZAC activity and indicate if they see any potential problems they should know about sooner rather than later. Mr. Markey stated that ZAC has talked about Legacy Farms as a high priority but that the Sasaki Associates recommendations for East Hopkinton should also be included. Mr. Weismantel stated they are going to study this thoroughly but ZAC has not seen Boulder Capital yet and it could bog them down. Mr. Abate stated that the Sasaki study was very expensive and the Planning Board is under the microscope so it is important to have some thought around it. Ms. Wright stated she would like to caution against work overload and they should not have too many big items at once. Ms. Kramer referred to information received from Ms. Lazarus regarding traffic and stated they should look at existing as well as future traffic corridors. She explained that for instance Front St. could become a traffic corridor as a result of increased pressure on the existing roads. Mr. Weismantel stated that Boulder Capital's MEPA process will take all that into consideration and Ms. Kramer stated she does believe the MEPA study will help.
- Ms. Wright stated she has noticed that two big pine trees were removed from the right of way on Saddle Hill Rd. on the corner of Clydesdale Ln. She stated that Saddle Hill Rd. is a scenic road, and Ms. Lazarus stated she will look into it. Mr. Weismantel stated that it appears that work is still being done at 112 Ash St. Ms. Lazarus noted that a scenic road application was filed and will follow up.

Adjourned: 9:55 P.M.

Cobi Wallace
Administrative Assistant

Approved: October 15, 2007