

BELLINGHAM PLANNING BOARD

P.O. BOX 43

BELLINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 02019

RICHARD V. DILL, CHAIRMAN

PAUL CHUPA

VALERIE DeANGELIS

ANNE M. MORSE

WILLIAM M. WOZNIAK

STEVEN CHOINIERE (Alt.)

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

June 24, 1999

Meeting commenced at 7:00 pm. All members were present except WW. Planning Board Consultant Philip Herr was also present. Minutes recorded by Planning Coordinator Jill Karakeian.

GENERAL BUSINESS

Stuart LeClair, Building Inspector and Earl Vater, Asst. Building Inspector came to the meeting to go over procedures.

RD asked a few questions regarding a form that Phil Herr had drawn up around September of 1998. When this form is filled out, it determines whether an applicant needs a Site Plan or Development Plan Review. Asked if the Building Department has the forms.

S. LeClair said that they have those forms in the office.

RD asked what happens with them?

S. LeClair says that they are given to any applicants that are applying for industrial or commercial permits.

RD asked where the form goes once it is filled out by the applicant?

S. LeClair mentions the Old Post Office at 9 North Main St. and said that he filled the form out and I never got it. It is supposed to be with the permit application and filed for permanent record.

P. Herr asked if it ever comes back to the Planning Board?

S. LeClair said that it could.

RD says that a copy should come back to the Planning Board for our files. The purpose of this meeting is to not point the finger at any one person but to open up the communications between the two boards.

VD suggests sending it to us if they have to come before the Planning Board so we have it at the beginning of the application process and we can make it part of our file.

RD mentions in the bylaws under Section 1422 Development Plan Review, it says "the applicants are urged to confirm with the Town Inspector regarding the materials necessary for submittal for a Development Plan Review if applicable. Following such conference the applicant will receive a project scoping letter outlining the scope for the materials appropriate to prepare and submit and apply." First of all, what do we call the materials? It says to "talk to the Town Inspector regarding the material's necessary for submittal."

P. Herr everything that is required for a submittal.

RD asked if that happens now? Do the people come to the you, Stuart?

S. LeClair says that they come to me and we give them that form now, that Phil drew up, then if they are required to come before the Planning Board, we send them over to the Town Clerk to get the necessary applications.

RD says that there is something in the bylaw that I need clarification from Phil, the Board and Stuart. Same Section, part E, it says "no occupancy permit shall be issued by the Building Inspector until he has been notified in writing by the Planning Board that it has either received certification from a registered architect, landscape architect, engineer or other design professional that all construction has been completed in accordance with approved development plan or has received surety for completion within a reasonable amount of time for specified incomplete elements such as landscaping, roadway top course who's delay completion has been determined by the Board not to impair safety or an inconvenience for users of the site." First of, it says that we need a letter from some engineer/architect saying, yes this has been built to compliance of the approved plans.

P. Herr says we should be getting a letter or something from somebody.

J. Karakeian says that we get nothing.

S. LeClair mentions that when he does controlled construction, he gets an affidavit from the engineer/architect. You could probably get that, and I can see that gets into play.

RD says that he thinks the best thing to do is to adhere to it, making it our policy now that we need to get an Affidavit from the applicant's engineer saying, "yes, it was built per the approved Development Plan that were approved by the Planning Board".

VD asked who gets the Affidavit?

RD says that the way this reads, we get the affidavit, once we see that it was built to plans, then we would draft a letter to Stuart saying everything is fine.

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING

June 24, 1999

S. LeClair asked to get a copy of the Affidavit to the Planning Board for his records.

JK mentions that usually when occupancies are needed, they need them quickly. They are not going to be able to wait for a Planning Board meeting.

AM says that wouldn't be fair to ask someone to wait for their occupancy. I would be content with Stuart getting the Affidavit, and sending the Board a copy.

VD says the lack of control is the problem. Once it leaves this Board approved, the Planning Board doesn't know when anyone is looking for an occupancy, other than to drive by the site. Stuart is the one that is involved throughout the whole construction up to the occupancy.

AM says that she doesn't think making them wait for a meeting is appropriate.

RD says then we should change the rule.

S. LeClair says that he can make that part of his final and request an affidavit showing that everything complies with the approved plan by the Planning Board.

P. Herr says that this bylaw does not call upon the Planning Board to make any determinations. They simply get a piece of paper or they do not. If the Board were to so vote, they could authorize anyone to accept the affidavit and proceed.

RD says that is fine.

JK asked the Board if they were okay with all the files that are in the Annex to be moved into the Building Department in the added spaces that they now have.

The Board was okay with that.

VD asked Stuart about the letter that is sent to him once a Site Plan or Development Plan is approved. On the letter, sometimes, there are some small conditions noted and sometimes that falls by the wayside and those conditions don't get met. Is there anything we can do to make sure those items get highlighted to make sure those things get done.

S. LeClair says that his office is in the process of getting more organized and he feels that in the near future everything is going to be much better. Right now I don't have the staff to keep up with everything.

CENTRE RUN ESTATES

Thomas DiPlacido, Jr. comes before the Board to request the remaining bond amount that is being held on Centre Run Estates. The road was accepted

AM motions to release the bond in full plus interest for Centre Run Estates held in Walpole Corp. Bank Passbook No. 30730. The amount being held is \$13,400.00. VD seconded. Unanimous vote of 4 (RD, PC, VD and AM).

BUNGAY BROOK GOLF CLUB – SPECIAL PERMIT & DEVELOPMENT PLAN
REVIEW – continued

Joe Antonellis, Attorney representing TRG Family Realty Trust for the Bungay Brook Golf Club. We filled a Special Permit for the removal of ground cover in a water resource district on the theory that there was a potential ground cover on more than 75% of the existing acreage. It continues to be the position of the applicant that if one were to go out and conduct a complete site examination that they would find that in excess of 35 acres of a 55 acre parcel are under continual farming and do not constitute ground cover. Therefore, the permit is not necessary. We filled it to make certain that if someone raised the issue as to where corn dying at the end of the summer created ground cover, then we have all the necessary Special Permits. We are here continuing along that line tonight and it was our understanding from the last meeting that there had not been any comments received from the Town's consultant and also there were some questions relative to issues that were tied into Site Plan and some storm water management issues.

P. Herr says that he received correspondence from Horsley & Whitten this afternoon. There are several issues that exist. One is concern over pesticides and chemicals that are going to be used on the site as well as the monitoring and managing of the site.

RD asked who does the monitoring?

P. Herr said he wasn't quite sure of that. But, whoever does the monitoring a report should be submitted if not to us, but definitely to the Conservation Commission.

RD asked if the other golf courses in Bellingham have some sort of monitoring and report filed? If they do, who does it, if they don't, why not?

P. Herr says that this is the first golf course that is in a Water Resource District. The applicant monitors the site and he has two monitoring wells shown on the drawings. Horsely & Whitten says that the drawings they have don't show where the monitoring wells are located.

P. Gareau said that Horsley & Whitten told us where they wanted the monitoring wells and who we should report to. They suggested that the reports should go to Mr. DiMartino. We will have a superintendent on the site that will do the monitoring and the reports.

P. Herr says that we only have one site in town right now that reports and that is the existing Power Plant on Depot Street. I don't know if there is some way that there is some simple certificate that these people could give to the Town each year that says the levels on the site are okay.

Howard Mouwer says that there is such a certificate but you must be a part of the N.A.A. and it costs a lot of money. There will be a person that the Gareau's will hire that is certified to monitor the pesticides and they will be tested by a certified lab.

P. Herr mentions that there was a bunch of information that never reached him and didn't know if it reached the Planning Board. There was a Water Quality Monitoring Report, responses to comments and maybe some plans. There are items that will be incorporated in the decision.

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING

June 24, 1999

VD motions to close the Special Permit public hearing for Bungay Brook Golf Club. AM seconded. Unanimous vote of 4 (RD, PC, VD and AM).

VD motions to direct Phil Herr to draft an approval decision for Bungay Brook Golf Club Special Permit with conditions that none of the restricting compounds be used and also that an annual monitoring report be presented to the Board regarding pesticides and fertilizers application on the site and to incorporate all documentation referenced in consultants Tom Sexton from Horlsey & Whitten letter of June 24, 1999 as well as monitoring of the usage should the application of the pesticides and fertilizers go over at some point per Phil's statement. AM seconded. Unanimous vote of 4 (RD, PC, VD and AM).

P. Herr says that with the Development Plan Review, it appears that all of the real issues have been dealt with, with the exception of the pond, it's depth and it's means of security. You have standard, which says, a detention pond can't be more than 5' deep. Also, it says that it has to have a fence around it. There is some question as to whether this is a detention pond, or whether it is an irrigation pond.

VD asked how deep the pond is?

M. Simmons says that the bottom elevation of the pond is 207'. We are going to maintain 10' deep.

H. Mauer suggests tapering the edges in for the first 10' to 15' in to go at a 5 to 1 slope then go to a 3 to 1. It is going to be a lined pond. We are trying to hold a volume of water in the pond for irrigation purposes.

VD asked about the wintertime and what will happen to the pond?

P. Gareau said that it will be drained down, but there will still be water in there.

J. Antonellis says that there would be no problem putting up a snow fence around the pond in the winter time.

VD asked what the height of the snow fence?

P. Gareau says 4'.

RD asked the Board if the pond is going to have a gradual slope of 5 to 1 in the beginning and then go to a 3 to 1?

VD motions to close the Development Plan Review Public Hearing for Bungay Brook Golf Club. AM seconds. Unanimous vote of 4 (RD, PC, VD and AM).

VD motions to approve the Bungay Brook Golf Club Development Plan Review and direct Phil Herr to draft a decision including conditions that there be a snow fence 4' surrounding the detention basin and that the applicant provide indemnification for the town relative to the two waivers, one that the depth of the basin is deeper than the 5' required and that no fence be required. AM seconded. Unanimous vote of 4 (RD, PC, VD and AM).

STOR/GUARD – SPECIAL PERMIT & DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW – Public Hearing – Continued

Nick Abraham presented to the Board pictures of what the project would look like. We have build a facility similar in Walpole and we are building one in Northboro right now. We take a great deal of pride with the way our facilities look. We have gabled roofs, we have both garage type units and climate controlled units. Our landscaping is very important to us and usually exceeds the town's requirements.

Andy Truman of Samiotes Engineering goes over comments made by Merrican Engineering who is the abutters (Mr. & Mrs. Dexter's) engineer. Mentions that most of the buildings are one story, but there is a two story building towards the back of the project. Goes over the drainage of the site as well as the drainage coming off of the roofs of the building and off of the paved areas of the site. Mentions that the plans that are in front of the Board tonight are comprised of many meetings with Walter Amory and says that he has approved these plans. As far as Merrican Engineer's comments, we feel that there were two types of comments. One was details that were missing and the other related to the Stormwater Management and Water Quality. We have modified most of the drawings. There was mention that the locus map was missing and we added it to the front page of the drawings. Owners of the adjacent properties were missing and we added those. There were some question about a low point with regards to wetlands. There are wetlands on the other side of Hartford Ave.

Dan Merrican of Merrican Engineering says that with regard to this particular comment was driven by the requirement in the Zoning Bylaw under Section 1423 (c) which required the documentation that all required submittals have been made to other agencies, such as Conservation Commission, Board of Health, etc. Some of the comments from various Town Boards would indicate that the last time of the comments, alot of these permits have not been applied for. You're bylaw specifically requires that the applicant present evidence that they have applied for all required permits. Mr. Dexter's has spoke to Conservation Commission and they seem to feel that the area where the detention basin is proposed to discharge, which is under the high-tension wires, may be an area subject to jurisdiction of the Wetland Protection Act. Mr. Dexter took some photographs of that area back in February (passed them out to the Board) and you can see it is quite wet.

N. Abraham responds that they already have a curb cut that exists on the property. We have spoke to the DPW and they have said that we could get a hook-up, but there would be a delay. They recommended a private septic. As far as the wetlands are concerned, we hired a botanist and the botanist has said that there may be vegetated wetlands at the back of the site, but we put our development far enough way were the wetlands won't be effected.

D. Merrican asked if the applicant has presented to the Board these various permits?

RD says no.

N. Abraham says that they even walked to the site with the Fire Chief and he asked us to put some hydrants on the property.

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING

June 24, 1999

Tom Guerin mentions that he never walked to the property, but he did comment on the plans that he received in the office. Now I have a concern because that back building is a two-story building, it is going to need sprinklers and the DPW will probably want the water to be looped further towards that 2-story building.

D. Merrican asked if the applicant would be proposing sewer or a septic system? If it is septic, has the system been designed and shown on the plans?

A. Truman says it is not.

D. Merrican says that is one of the permits that is required to present to the Board.

N. Abraham says that we can assure the Board that we have applied and we can submit the paperwork that we did apply and that the person in charge said that there is no capacity for sewer and they recommend we do septic.

P. Herr says that something in writing from the applicant and various Boards saying that certain permits have been applied for.

VD asked if they knew where the septic system is intended to be located?

A. Truman says in the vicinity of the office/caretaker's building. We have done some perc. tests on the site.

VD asked if they have submitted to the Conservation Commission yet?

N. Abraham says no. We would usually do that afterwards. We are going to file for a request for determination.

P. Herr says that, I suppose then we will hold this hearing open until we hear what the Conservation Commission says. That is the reason why that requirement is in the bylaws.

RD reads letter from Conservation Commission dated 11/10/98. "The Conservation Commission is in receipt of revised plans for the Stor/Guard proposal and wish to offer the following comments. Since the entire proposal is located in a Water Resource District under 4950(d) the proponent is proposing runoff from impervious surfaces greater than 30% and therefore must provide evidence that this runoff will be recharged onsite. This may be a problem with the clay bottom basins as proposed. In addition, recharge water body becomes an important issue to the significant amount of impervious materials proposed on the site. The drawing provided is unclear as to the actual western property boundary. Please keep in mind, that if the 325' wide New England Power Co. easement is a portion of this property, that the right of way is substantially clear and in many areas conditions of unvegetated soils are there. The applicant shall take into account that this area, when calculating the total amount of area to be cleared of trees. You may find substantially more than 52.6% of the property will be altered. The Commission strongly recommends when making important decisions of this nature you're Board visits the site to familiarize yourself with existing various proposed conditions. Geotechnical data should be provided relative to soil profiles and depth to ground water to provide information relative to the possibility of maximum recharge. The Planning Board shall be aware that the area proposed for

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING

June 24, 1999

development by Stor/Guard is also the staging area for the Algonquin Gas Transmission Co.'s horizontal directional drill for crossing the Charles River. The actual pipeline root runs the length of the property West to East on the Southerly boarder. The applicant shows a small area of jurisdictional wetlands subject to flooding on the property. To date there is no official determination relative to the potential impact of this area. The Commission strongly recommends the Board seeks alternatives with potentially less impact.

N. Abraham says that he believes that is why this Board asked us to consult with Mr. Amory. Up to this point we were lead to believe by your Board and by your Planner that we were to follow a certain procedure, and that we have done. If we have been misinformed and we need to do something that is required, we will be happy to do it.

D. Merrican says that the area that the pictures were taken from are up along Hartford Ave. and the front of the proposed site and were they are planning on the discharge from their drainage. We feel it is very important that they atleast file for a Request for Determination with the Conservation Commission.

VD asked Jill if the Board has received any correspondence from Amory Engineering?

P. Herr says that a letter was received from Mr. Amory on May 26, 1999, following which I spoke to him. As of today, I have not received any approval. That letter of May 26th doesn't say everything is fine.

Tom Manning (304 Hartford Ave. - direct abutter) and says that the proposed site is right up to his driveway and he is concerned about his septic system. His leach field is in that parking lot towards the back close by the proposed project.

AM says that if they own the land then if you're septic system is on their land, then unfortunately, it is you're problem.

VD explains that there is going to be a fence and screening.

RD asked if there was anyway that we can motion that we continue this but when we do come back for this hearing we really need have certain items cleared up.

T. Guerin asked that new plans be submitted showing the two story building and sprinklers as well as the water main looping more towards that building.

N. Abraham says they will meet with the Fire Department with regards to that. We will also apply to Conservation Commission for a Request for Determination as well as the Board of Health.

AM motions to continue the Special Permit and Development Plan Review for Stor/Guard to July 22, 1999 at 9:00 pm. VD seconds. Unanimous vote of 4 (RD, PC, VD and AM).

AM motions to grant an extension for time to act for the Special Permit and Development Plan Review for Stor/Guard to August 13, 1999. VD motions. Unanimous vote of 4 (RD, PC, VD and AM).

D. Merrican suggests that the plans and comments be reviewed both by Mr. Herr from a planning standpoint and Mr. Amory from a technical drainage design standpoint. That is they way we would like to see this get resolved.

**MAPLEBROOK COMMONS – SPECIAL PERMIT & DEVELOPMENT PLAN
REVIEW – PUBLIC HEARING – Continued**

Bob Maschi of Real-Estate Engineering Management is in front of the Board requesting a continuation due to a only a four member board. We are also requesting an extension for time to act.

P. Herr asked if Town Counsel has sent anything to the Board regarding this project?

JK mentions that she spoke to Town Counsel and he still needs to see more correspondence, but he feels that the project is in violation right now because the existing condominiums are not being hooked up to town sewer.

RD suggests JK being in contact with Lee and making sure he gets what he needs to respond.

P. Herr suggests the opportunity for the applicant's attorney to speak to Lee.

AM motions to continue the Special Permit and Development Plan Review for Maplebrook Commons to July 22, 1999 at 8:00 pm. VD seconded. Unanimous vote of 4 (RD, PC, VD and AM).

AM motions to grant the extension requested for the Development Plan Review for Maplebrook Commons to August 13, 1999.

81-P SUBMISSION – Blackstone Street – Brad Allen

Atty. John Connor representing Brad Allen presented to the Board a plan showing five (5) 81-P lots on Blackstone Street. It will bring the total number of built-upon lots up to twelve (12) along with this plan there is plan to define a 40' right of way. What we propose to do within that 40' right of way is to have the entire way cleaned up and graveled to the Blackstone Town line and he would pave the area up to and add hammer head turn arounds at Lot 5 and Lot 3. There would be 18' width paved road to be consistent with what is there now and whatever specifications that the Board requires. He would put the boulders and form the barrier at the end of the hammer head turn arounds at Lot 5 and Lot 3.

P. Herr asked if he proposes to make the improvements to the road first before he expects the Board to sign the 81-P plan?

Atty. Connor said that he would much rather have the plan signed first so that he doesn't invest a lot of money and find out that he can't have anything.

P. Herr asks how the Board makes sure that they sign the plan and then the road doesn't get done?

Atty. Connor suggests that the Board set a Bond and Mr. Allen would be glad to put that bond up and file some sort of covenant. I will be glad to meet with Mr. DiMartino to get everything in line before the next time the Board meets.

JK says that July 22, 1999 at 7:15 was available.

Atty. Connor says that we should have everything in line by then.

9 NORTH MAIN STREET - C&C REALTY TRUST

Corey Finkelstein of C&C Realty Trust comes before the Board to discuss the building he owns at 9 North Main Street and what they are doing there as far as construction and additions. He says that they did some things out of order unbenounced to us. We went to the Building Inspector, who issued a building permit. We have built an addition of 3,000 square feet which transformed a parking lot into an indoor parking garage. After the fact, it was discovered that we should come before you to discuss and we should have done this prior to the building permit being issued. The addition is over 1,000 square feet, is the one that is answered yes and I think what happened in the Building Inspector's Department is we talked about adding parking spaces from outdoor to indoor, and I think it got by them that the addition is over 1,000 SF.

RD did the Building Department say, "Well, it is over 1,000 SF, but don't worry about it."

C.Finkelstein says he is not sure and he is not here to point fingers or get anyone in trouble. I think a mistake did occur and they faxed the form to me after the permit was issued. I filled it in and faxed it back the next day and somewhere it got lost and they asked me for it again about 30 days later. I pulled the one I filled out earlier and faxed it again to the Inspector's office. The Building Inspector then called me and he was unhappy. He asked me to come see him as soon as possible. He informed me that there was a problem and suggested that I come before the Planning Board and find out how to fix the problem.

P. Herr says that he spoke to Mr. Finkelstein's attorney, Laura Mann. I suggested that you make a written request for waivers on certain submittal requirements under the Development Plan Review. They have an existing site, that they are not changing most of what is on the site.

RD asked what the total square feet of the building is with the addition?

C.Finkelstein says it is about 5,500 square feet.

RD asked if the parking calculations have ever been done on that building?

JK reads a portion of Atty. Laura Mann's letter which applies to the waivers that are being requested. "In particular, many of the requirements which relate to drainage, topography and the effective of the proposed development on adjacent properties really do not apply to the property at 9 North Main Street. As to the entire site area where the addition was constructed was hard topped and therefore impervious prior to the construction. Likewise, any runoff from roof would travel in the same manner as occurred before construction (ie, rear of the property). Likewise, there are no traffic concerns with the new addition as it is manly to be used by the current tenant for the inside storage of their trucks once they are loaded. Presently, the tenant brings it's trucks

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING

June 24, 1999

to the property for loading, but since they do not wish to leave their filled trucks outside overnight, must coordinate the loading to occur directly before leaving the property before deliveries. Given the above, I would appreciate the Board's review of the enclosed application and advise what, if any, additional information is needed in order for Development Review and approval to occur. If you wish, I would be happy to meet with the Planning Board at your convenience.

P. Herr says that is alright.

RD says that he keeps hearing that this is covering up parking, but I've gone by there before and seen up to 10 trucks parked back there in the locked gate. I would like to see you put 10 cars in that garage.

C.Finkelstein says that you can.

SC asked the size of the addition?

C.Finkelstein says that it is roughly 42' x 50'.

P. Herr says that Atty. Mann asked what the Board is concerned about? I told her the Board is concerned about traffic and they are concerned about stormwater. She is saying that both those items are no different than what they were before.

RD says that my concerns are parking and the use of that building. How do we go about calculating the parking?

P. Herr says that you can ask for a drawing showing where the parking was before the addition and where the parking is now.

AM asked what they do in that building?

C.Finkelstein explains that a tenant called ESP rents the building. ESP purchased Hamilton Test Equipment and they go from dealership or garage to dealership and keeps the emissions inspection equipment up and running. The state has mandated a new Massachusetts State Inspection System and it is far more complicated. The new equipment is 50, 60, 70 thousand dollars per each shop and they have to install over 200 of these by October 1st. They want to put the trucks in the addition loaded with the equipment at night, because they're going to have 5 or 6 trucks going out every day to do installations. They don't want those trucks filled sitting outside with that equipment. This building is used as a depot base. There is nobody on site on a day to day basis. Sometimes they meet there once a week. They store some electronic equipment there to fix the equipment.

AM mentions that once this equipment is installed and they are all done, is someone else going to rent the building? That is one of the problems.

C.Finkelstein says that C&C Realty Trust has owned the property since the mid 70's when it was the Bellingham Post Office. When the Post Office moved out, St. Vincent DePaul's rented it.

MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING

June 24, 1999

Then ESP moved in. If parking becomes a problem at some point, then we will rearrange, we will do so.

T. Guerin questioned the addition being filled with vehicles and the safety of that.

C.Finkelstein says that they plan on filling the addition with 2 or 3 trucks a night.

RD says that he is looking for a definition of the use of the building, so that we can intern figure out what parking is required. We would like to also have something telling us what is being stored in the building. We would like it to go through a small Development Plan review.

C.Finkelstein says that the Building Inspector told him that no Certificate of Occupancy would be signed off until the Planning Board is satisfied.

VD says that she agrees with RD and that we need to look at the lighting, the parking, the screening and that should be on a plan so we can look at that.

RD asked again about the form and what happened to it.

C.Finkelstein explains how it went. A building permit was sot and given. After the building permit was issued, about 3 or 4 days, I was faxed that form to fill out. It was filled in and faxed back to the Building Inspector's office and I didn't hear from them.

RD asked if he understood what the form said and what it was asking?

C.Finkelstein says that he didn't read it, I had someone else fill it in, I just signed it. I gave it to my wife and asked her to fill it in. We have been in existence since 1963 and it is not something new to us. This addition to us was not a huge building. We didn't think that what we were doing was causing anyone discomfort or harm.

P. Herr says that he thinks the Board should respond to the letter it received with regard to what it wants for a submittal. One plan showing where the driveways and parking spaces are. Also, a diagram of the ground floor of the building so we can see where the parking is inside of the building.

C.Finkelstein asked when the use changes in that building, should he come before this Board?

RD says yes.

GENERAL BUSINESS

P. Herr turns in his invoices for the end of the year. One is a quarterly payment and one is the end of the Master Plan invoice.

The Board signs miscellaneous invoices.

P. Herr asked if it is time to do the traffic study for Deer Run's gate? There is a trigger for a certain amount of time after the development is constructed, there is suppose to be a traffic study.

RD suggests JK pulling out the Deer Run folder for the next meeting.

MINUTES ACCEPTED

VD motions the approve the May 13, 1999 minutes with the following changes: Pg. 2 – ½ way down the page where it says "RD said my concern is that if it 37,000 volts and you are just burring it 1'." It should be "berry". Pg. 5 – ¼ of the way down "Eventually that structure will be replaced by units that are building built." It should be "being built". Pg. 6 – "VD says that you are targeting 55 and older but is there anything to stop someone from having their adult child 55 and older living with them?" It should say their adult child under 55". Pg. 13 – last line "VD says that the people that live over there are going to sew the town." It should say sue. PC seconds. Unanimous vote of 4 (RD, PC, VD and AM).

VD motions to approve the May 27, 1999 minutes with just one revision on Pg. 5 – at the top it says on the third line where it says "stock" it should be "bond". AM seconds. Unanimous vote of 4 (RD, PC, VD and AM).

AM moves to adjourn at 11:05 pm. VD seconds. Unanimous vote of 4 (RD, PC, VD, and AM).



Richard V. Dill, Chairman



Paul Chupa



Valerie DeAngelis

Anne M. Morse

William M. Wozniak