

BELLINGHAM PLANNING BOARD

P.O. BOX 43

BELLINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 02019

RICHARD V. DILL, CHAIRMAN

PAUL CHUPA

VALERIE J. DeANGELIS

ANNE M. MORSE

WILLIAM M. WOZNIAK

STEVEN CHOINIERE (Alt.)

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

January 13, 2000

Meeting commenced at 7:00 pm. All members were present. Minutes recorded by Planning Coordinator Jill Karakeian.

GENERAL BUSINESS

WW mentions the flagpole that was granted to AT&T on the same site as the Summit Bank. He remembered AT&T saying that there was going to be an American Flag put up on the pole and nothing is there yet.

RD doesn't remember them saying that there was going to be a flag put up. He thought they had just said that it was meant to look like a flagpole.

WW thought they also stated the size of the flag and it was big.

RD asked JK to look at the minutes to see if it is stated anywhere about a flag to be placed on the pole.

AM questioned if that was something we should insist on.

WW says that if the Board asked for something then it should be insisted upon.

SC mentions that this issue that they might be facing is that if they do put an American Flag up there, then there either has to be a light lighting it up 24 hours a day or someone has to put the flag up and down on a daily basis.

The Board signed payroll for JK and miscellaneous invoices.

JK told the Board that she found the minutes for Bainbridge Woods stating that they would install a guardrail at the top of the retaining wall for safety. I also called Ed Gately and let him know as well.

RD mentioned the letter that was sent to the Board from Mark Nixon dated 12/20/99 and asked Ted Bailey if he was familiar with the property and the concerns of Mr. Nixon?

T. Bailey said that it is torn up but it is within the right of way of the roadway. It is not near his property. When they put the water main extension for the request of the Department they went in front of his property.

RD asked if we could make the Contractor go and fix that portion to loam and seed?

T. Bailey said that whenever a Contractor goes into any public work way, they have a street opening permit. The DPW holds a bond. TNT, the subcontractor that performed the work has requested release of their bond money for the street opening permit and they were denied because of that area.

RD so that is going to be fixed?

T. Bailey says yes.

RD asked JK to respond to Mr. Nixon making him aware of what the process is and that it is going to be taken care of.

STOR/GARD SPECIAL PERMIT/DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW DECISION DISCUSSION

WW abstains from the vote.

AM says that she has a problem with accepting the most recent letter from the Conservation Commission now that the hearing is closed.

PC agrees with AM.

RD mentions that the letter issued by Conservation Commission is a reiteration of a letter that was issued way back when. It was already said and it is nothing after the fact.

AM motions to approve the Decision for the Special Permit and Development Plan Review for Stor/Gard. PC seconds. Vote of 2 in support of (AM and PC) and vote of 2 against (VD and RD).

RD suggests JK talking to Town Counsel and asking how and in what format this needs to be filed with the Town Clerk.

GENERAL BUSINESS – continued

RD suggests discussing Summit Bank's sign and the minutes from the Zoning Board Meeting and get the Board's opinion. The variance that was issued to Summit Bank was based upon the size of the sign. There was verbiage in the application making note of illumination. It didn't specify the article or our bylaw. In my eyes, it was not a variance for the flashing.

WW says the applicant applied under Section 3110 for the size and also stating in his application that there was going to be an LED display. When they went before the Zoning Board for a variance, they stated to the Zoning Board that it would not flash. The Zoning Board granted the variance on Section 3110. That article refers to size of a sign not the flashing of a sign which is Section 3111.

RD says that there is verbiage in the application pertaining to flashing or the illumination of the sign.

WW says that their documentation of that meeting that they voted on was that it would not flash and it came from the officials of the bank.

AM asked if the Zoning Board agrees that this is not a flashing sign?

RD says that they do agree that it is.

AM asked why the Planning Board is handling this and not the Building Inspector?

RD says that he won't do anything unless he gets something from the Zoning Board.

AM says what more can we do?

RD says we asking what the Board thinks we should do at this point?

WW says that I think what needs to be done now is send a letter to the Board of Selectman, cc to Denis Fraine, Building Inspector and the Zoning Board of Appeals with a copy of the minutes highlighting the important parts.

BROOKSIDE ESTATES – DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION MODIFICATIONS – PUBLIC HEARING

WW motions to waive the reading of the notice in the newspaper. PC seconds. Vote of 5 (RD, PC, VD, AM and PC).

Don DiMartino passes out correspondence with regards to scenarios for Brookside Estates using the money that is available for this project. We took the bond on this project from Mr. Ballarino who was not performing and indicated to us that he had no intention to perform. We have taken security of \$60,800.00 which was the initial security and there was no bond reduction. We had a cost estimate to complete the project of around \$100,000.00 to repair damages and to construct the roadway. There was concern at the meeting of late September of the condition of several

sections of the roadway for the winter and we had a contractor in town doing similar work so we had them go over on a time and material basis and they spent about 3 days getting the roadway in a condition that can get through the winter. We spent roughly \$12,300.00 leaving us \$48,500.00 to complete or to make an attempt to complete the roadway. I have come up with various scenarios removing different items to cut costs down to what we have to spend.

VD asked if the detention basin was working and if there is water in there?

D. DiMartino says that he doesn't know if there is water in the detention basin. If the basin is connected to the drainage system and there are no curbing in the street, then it isn't working properly. The pipe has been installed. There was a concern from Mr. Grant who asked what is going to happen to the catch basins that are now set at 24'. When you narrow the roadway, there will be an installation of Mass Highway standard gutter inlet.

WW states that he is not going to waive the fence around the basin.

RD says that before we decide on which way is the best scenario and what to remove, I would like to ask what means are available to getting additional funds to complete the project as designed.

D. DiMartino says that it is his understanding that it is no different than any other capital improvement and therefore it would be a request, initially through the Board of Selectmen also copies to the Capital Improvement Committee and placed on Town Meeting for an article.

RD asked about emergency funds?

D. DiMartino says that as far as emergency funds, the other avenue is to approach the Finance Committee as a reserve fund transfer. You then go to Town Meeting for authorization. Emergency Funds have to be an obvious threat to life or private property.

RD says that he feels we should opt for another avenue and not compromise yet.

VD questioned the detention basin and asked if it will be functioning? Will there be water in there?

WW explains that it is built to withstand a 100 year flood. It works for every storm, if the drainage is properly installed.

RD asked Ted Bailey to explain how it is suppose to work.

Ted Bailey explains that the pond is a retention pond and it does have an outlet. When there is a storm and water collects in there it will empty out that pond completely. There is a 4" pipe and if there is more water than the 4" can handle then it will retain the water in the structure until it stops raining and then it will empty itself out.

RD asked if right now are the catch basins at the point where they can collect the water and go into the basin?

Ted Bailey says no.

VD says then it is not functioning properly at this point.

Ted Bailey says that it is not collecting the surface water because the road is not complete.

VD says that she is concerned with the safety hazard. If the Town removes the fence, a fence that was required and anything happens. Then the Town would be liable, I would think. Does the engineering affect people when they want to sell their property?

D. DiMartino says that yes, when someone goes to have a plot plan done and they are supposed to be able to find bounds fairly close to their house and that won't be able to happen so the cost for the plot plan would be increased because of the inconvenience.

VD says that she is okay with reducing the street width and removing the sidewalks due to these roads both being dead ends and not busy. I'm not sure I understand what is involved with the work done by DPW is.

D. DiMartino says that street sweeping is something the DPW can do. Some of the items that we can do is much less than if it is bid out. Town Meeting acceptance is something we can do that can save money.

RD says that he doesn't want to nit pick right now until we see if we can get all the money to get the work done as designed.

AM agrees to the road width being reduced, but she thinks we really need to keep the sidewalks.

Mr. McDonald (abutter on Brookside Road) asked about his property and the damage that was done.

D. DiMartino says that is something that could be fixed rather easily if we reduce the road width to 20'.

Glenn Gerrier mentions that the sidewalks are required for builders and it isn't right just because the builder walked away that the sidewalk shouldn't still be required to be installed.

RD asked what the process is to get in front of the Finance Committee.

D. DiMartino suggests RD contact the Finance Committee and get on their Agenda to discuss this informally.

JK called the Finance Committee and they said RD and D. DiMartino could come in at their meeting of January 18th at 7:30pm for an informal discussion.

Terry Dyer (resident of Edgehill Lane) just wanted an explanation as to the \$55,000.00 damage that we are now in the hole for. I know Ted Bailey was up there every day and if all that damage was happening, Ted also has boss and why wasn't this all nipped in the bud?

RD says that once the Town takes it over it becomes a prevailing wage job. When a Developer puts a job out to bid, I'm sure they also take the lowest bidder which sometimes is the problem also. We had a workshop with quite a bit of attendees and we are now enforcing higher bond rates to set the Town up so if there is a situation where there has been damage, then it can be fixed with the monies being held.

AM motions to continue the Definitive Subdivision Modification Public Hearing for Brookside Estates to January 27, 2000 @ 7:30 pm. VD seconds. Vote of 5 (RD, PC, VD, AM and WW).

**BELLINGHAM SHOPPING CENTER – SPECIAL PERMIT AND DEVELOPMENT
PLAN REVIEW – PUBLIC HEARING – CONTINUED**

AM abstains.

Bruce Babcock of Wilson Engineering as well as Mr. Dias, Highway and Traffic Safety Design and Mr. Sax, Attorney.

RD asked if we discussed the fencing and blocking behind and on the sides of the shopping center from the residential areas?

B. Babcock said that we did have a brief discussion regarding that and my client hasn't made a definite decision at this time, but he is considering fencing.

Glenn Gerrier (abutter) says that he spoke to Mr. Lorusso myself and he said that he would put fencing. The discussion at the last meeting was fencing at the rear of the property and along my property on one side of the property.

B. Babcock passes out the traffic report prepared by Mr. Dias.

JK asked if a copy went to Phil Herr?

B. Babcock says that he will get Phil a copy.

JK says that Phil doesn't have any comments on this because he hasn't seen anything new since our last meeting. Nobody has.

WW asked why are we here? All the information is supposed to be to the consultant by now before you come back here.

B. Babcock says that the information was completed in sufficient time to get it to the consultant for this meeting.

Mr. Dias presents the traffic report. We were brought in to look at the traffic issues on this project. We looked at the existing conditions. We looked at a typical background growth and came up with about 1% per year. We developed a 10 year design plan out to 2009 to account for full build out for the whole site including the Phase I building that is there now and also the Phase II buildings that are proposed. We went out and did traffic counts of December 1999 along South Main Street, intersection of Center Street and the intersection of Pulaski Blvd. We also, best we could, looked at accidents in the area. Generally, in this area we found that there hasn't been many accidents. For future conditions, we looked at 10 years down the road. We generated traffic for not only this site, but we also took into account for the 18 houses going in across the street. The existing traffic flow out on South Main we looked at a typical weekday afternoon and a Saturday midday. The weekday afternoon we got about 70% to and from the north and 30% to and from the south. During the Saturday midday it is almost a 50/50 split with the traffic. With a retail site some of the traffic that is projected is what they call pass by traffic. As far as the existing conditions and the impact of the project the plan that was approved in 1986 provided a left turn lane southbound into the site and a northbound right hand turn into the site. It was all done within the existing right of way along South Main Street. It also shows that the geometry will still work as far as the left and right turn. In 1986 there was no signal and right now there would be a signal warranted. The level of service, which is how we gauge on how an intersection works, for unsignalized and signalized intersections, were the level of service A being no traffic to service F. Typical intersections are in the C to D range. With the signal in place at this project the intersection will operate at a level service of B or C. There are issues with regards to the visibility coming north or south, whether that will be an issue. Right now you have about 700 to 800' stopping site distances both north and south. The signals will be up about 20' in the air and you will have that much more visibility coming up over the hill. We are also proposing to put signal ahead signs about 1000' in advance on either side. In addition to this area we looked at the intersections to the North (Center Street) and South (Pulaski Blvd.). The Center Street intersection, the biggest problem there right now is the left turn coming out of Center Street and that is currently operating at a level E and F. We are proposing to restripe the approach coming up Center Street to South Main Street to form a left and a right hand turn lane. That will improve the right turn. The left turn, there is really nothing that can be done. At Pulaski Blvd., there is more of a problem there. Existing right now, that intersection is a level service F.

SC asked about the turn lanes into the site, how many cars are you planning on stacking?

Dias said that will be worked out in the final design, but probably somewhere around 200' on the left turn. That is about 10 to 15 vehicles and that can be adjusted.

B. Babcock says that what we would like to propose is that we know a signal is needed. A signal design as such is not done at this time. We would propose to do the design and have it reviewed by the DPW and your consultant and make approval of the plan contingent on that design.

G. Gerrier wanted to mention that Mr. Lorusso has bought this property, bought the Weston Estates across the street, bought the old LePlante land off Susan Lane and is building two homes there. He has also purchased parcel A as shown on these plans, that used to be owned by the man who owned Burger King in Medway that is a future business site development. Rumor has it, from quite a few sources that he is also looking into the Sheaffer property. If so, there is over 100' acres of developable buildable land that will put an outlet out onto Route 126.

Atty. Sax says that he hasn't heard of such a purchase.

VD says that there is a potential for a large residential site coming out near that site.

B. Babcock says that we have looked at the existing conditions and as far as the property immediately around this, I don't feel it is our responsibility.

RD mentions that the last time we met on this was 11/22/99 and when we made a date for the next meeting on this the Board always asks if this is enough time for the applicant to get the information needed and requested. In the future, if you know that it isn't going to be enough time to get what information is needed to the property departments for review at least 5 workdays prior, then we really need to reschedule so we have some feedback and we are not wasting everyones time. Can we also get Mr. Lorusso to either put in writing or agree to what fencing is going to be where as far as the perimeter of the project and clearly marked on the print.

B. Babcock says that he will ask that of Lorusso.

VD asked for B. Babcock to verify what he had said earlier about the traffic signalization, that it wouldn't be done until a later date.

B. Babcock says that there are two parts to the traffic process. One is the study, what is the impact and so on. That has been done and it has told us about the turn lanes, etc. The second part it is the actual mathematical analysis about the timing, how the signal is set up, the foundation and design of the signal itself.

VD says she would think this would need to be done. In my opinion that would need to be done so that it could be reviewed by the Board's independent traffic consultant. Why is it that it couldn't be designed?

B. Babcock says it is simply the fact of time. We would like to proceed with this process.

WW anything that comes before this Board that requires signalization is designed and approved prior to approving the project. The paper works need to be done prior to approval. We have problems in this Town relying on things after the fact. Our procedure on this Board, that we require it before we say okay.

G. Gerrier suggests that at the next meeting it be a meeting when Phil Herr is present. We all benefit when he is here because he can directly comment on items that he can't when he isn't present at a meeting. The next question is, I have a problem still with the traffic light. On 11/22/99 we met and on 11/23/99 I called the police to let them know that five children in front of Charlie's Tire almost got killed. Because the bus heading South stopped and the car heading North stopped because the bus stopped, but the car behind that one didn't even see than and flew into the parking lot and slid and we pulled the kids away as we saw it happening. Trees have been taken down from in front of the house aside of Charlie's Tire. The right corner of the buildings has been taken out from traffic driving off the road. I don't know how the records show there isn't many accidents there. I feel that lights at the top of the hills would be the only way to help

this situation. Steve at Schaefer Nursery agrees with me as well. A yellow sign that says "Signal Ahead" means absolutely nothing on Route 126.

JK mentions also that she spoke to Tom Guerin of the Fire Department. He couldn't make it to tonight's meeting but he wanted to make sure that everyone knew that the Fire Department had some major questions about the water and hydrants on the site.

B. Babcock says that the Lorusso's are going to be excavating next week with some tracing equipment to try and locate the existing water system on the site. We know approximately where it is.

RD I feel you need to tell the Lorusso's that if we don't have updated plans and some progress the next time we are just going to roll the plans up and have them come back. I just don't want to keep wasting people's time.

B. Babcock explains that we are proposing to finish the existing building under Phase I, the Phase II areas will be rough graded, loamed and seeded so that it will be stabilized. As far as the drainage goes, the existing building currently goes down into an existing drain line and comes into the existing pond. The new building will be connected into the existing pond. We are looking at snow storage and would like some input from the Board. We have 70 extra parking spaces. Conservation wants us to put the snow storage as far away as the wetlands as possible. We have some parking on the side of the existing building that we would like to propose to use for snow storage.

The Board agreed that would be a good spot for snow storage on the site but would like to mention it to Phil.

VD asked what parking goes along with Phase I?

B. Babcock says that Phase I includes all the parking. We are going to loop with water, finish the water, finish the drainage, finish the sewerage, finish the parking, all the detention basis, lights, improvements under Phase I. Rough grade, loam and seed Phase II.

VD motions to continue the Special Permit and Development Plan Review Public Hearing for Bellingham Shopping Center to February 10, 2000 @ 9:30 pm and grant an extension for action to February 25, 2000. PC seconds. Vote of 5 (RD, PC, VD, WW and SC). AM abstains.

BELLINGHAM NEW HIGH SCHOOL – DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW – PUBLIC HEARING

AM abstains and leaves the room.

Craig Dennis, chairman of the New School Building Committee, Bob Russo, Director of Maintenance and David Fisher, engineer from Keyes Associates is in front of the Board to review the New High School.

RD asked if anyone has seen Phil Herr's comments?

David Fisher says that he has seen the comments from Mr. Herr. It is my responsibility that these projects get all the necessary permits and I apologize for not filing the Planning Board earlier.

WW asked if it is proper procedure in other towns to get all necessary approvals?

D. Fisher said that it isn't procedure in other towns. In the Massachusetts Zoning Enabling Act does specifically say that Municipal Projects are not required to go through the Zoning Bylaws. Unless the local Zoning Bylaws specifically requires municipal projects to obtain approval from Town Boards.

WW says that he went to a Planning classes and it was stated in the Regulations of Massachusetts that municipal projects are exempt from fees but they still need to come before the Planning Board.

D. Fisher apologizes again and proceeded with his presentation. Mr. Russo is meeting with the Independent Living Board which is required of all state funded projects over 10 million dollars. You give them the whole set of documents and prints and at no cost they review the project for total handicap accessibility. We have met the Massachusetts Architectural Barrier Acts, their requirements for handicap parking. All of our lights meet the letter of the law and the building is set so far back that I don't think that it would affect any of the abutters. If any of the lights do effect an abutter we can adjust them. I didn't provide Phil Herr with the site electrical, and I will if the Board would like me to.

VD asked if the building is totally handicapped accessible, then why couldn't Phil Herr identify that?

D. Fisher says he wasn't sure. It doesn't say handicapped accessible. If you look at the layout and you go into the grading plan. You can see that there are no steps and no slopes over 5% anywhere on the site. One place that there are steps on the site we provided a handicap ramp. We have designed retention basins to hold water and they don't outlet. There is an overflow valve on the southern basin which is down at the end of the main parking lot. On the signs, what we have are granite signs that say "Bellingham High School" inset into a stone wall. The stone wall itself is radius and is 30' long and is 24" high. The sign itself is 18" high and inset into the wall. It is a landscaped wall with the sign inside of it. There is a sign in each wall on both sides of the entrance.

VD mentions that you have two signs, and only one is allowed.

D. Fisher says that they will run the signs by the Zoning Board of Appeals and seek a variance if that is what is needed. With regards to islands in the parking lots, we have had many discussions with the committee. Everytime we proposed them, everyone says not to put them in because it makes it difficult to plow the parking lots. We do have planting plans and will submit a copy to Mr. Herr. The detention basins are fenced. They are 6' high vinyl coated chain link fences. There is a walkway to the fields not an access road. The state will come out to this facility after it is constructed to make sure that meets code.

Bob Russo stated that the town has paid an independent architect to review all of these plans.

VD asked if the town had an independent engineer review the drainage?

Bob Russo says, not that he knows.

Ted Bailey stated that he has been out at the site inspecting over the last month and a half for the water and sewer. As far as the site work, there is numerous inspections from Briggs doing compaction tests and we are comfortable having them on site on a daily basis.

VD says that she is just concerned because the normal procedure is that the Planning Board sends the drainage out to an independent engineer for their review.

PC says that the state is funding 70% of the project, they review everything.

WW says that if Phil has reviewed it and has not raised any specific concerns then it is not an issue.

SC questioned the ledge and soil on the site. Are the detention ponds built or located?

T. Bailey says that the ponds are located and being built. The gravel is the best I've seen yet. There is some ledge but the rest of the soil is great.

RD asked the Board if they were comfortable in leaving Keyes Associates finding on the storm water management with independent review?

All Board members were comfortable with that.

RD asked what the status of the lighting plan is?

D. Fisher says he will send Phil a copy of the lighting plans and details.

WW motions to approve the Development Plan Review for the New Bellingham High School as submitted. VD seconds. Vote of 4 (RD, PC, VD and WW). AM abstained

The Board asked JK to contact the Bellingham Senior Center to inform them that a Development Plan Review is required.

AM returned to the meeting.

J & P AUTO – SITE PLAN REVIEW

Paul Cameron and Atty. Jerry Moody was before the Board to present a Site Plan for the J & P Auto located on Farm Street.

J. Moody explains that this property as we know it is Carryville Mini Storage and J & P Auto. The building for J & P was built in about 1986 and the lower warehouses were built around the

same time. They went through Site Plan Review back then. Back at that time the land was zoned industrial. The reason we are here is because more recently, this past summer, Mr. Cameron went and asked to increase the number of vehicles allowed on this parcel. Back in the late 1980 the Town began to include in the Class II licenses the unregistered vehicles of customers that were out for sale or something held for storage. He always had 4 to 8 customer vehicles, unregistered on site or vehicles being stored, he was unable to have any vehicles on site for sale. He went before the Board of Selectman to seek an increase and at that time there were neighbors that had objections. Mr. Cameron, in 1997 got a building permit to build a smaller mini warehouse and an extension on an existing one. As it turns out, in fact he should have come before the Planning Board for a Site Plan or Development Plan Review. What the Selectmen wanted was Mr. Cameron to come before the Planning Board for the Site Plan Review to review and see if there were any violations and get your recommendation. What you see in regards to parking is more than adequate. There are 43 spaces for the mini warehouse and that still leaves 45 spaces on the site for vehicle storage. Mr. Cameron is proposing to the Selectmen 40 vehicles. 25 would be for sale and 15 would be reserved for customer unregistered vehicles. There is no construction being proposed, no building permits being applied for at this time.

RD asked if the plan went to Phil Herr?

Wilson Assoc. said yes.

RD asked if they say Mr. Herr's comments?

Wilson Assoc. says yes.

RD states that Phil's comments say that the materials that we have do not fully meet the submittal requirements for Development Plan Review. Were these plans designed in accordance with the bylaw?

J. Moody says that we are here first because we were told that the Selectmen felt that we needed to come before this board for a Site Plan Review.

Wilson Assoc. states that the plan submitted tonight is kind of an as-built of the site. Maybe Phil is suggesting that we submit this as if the added buildings were not there on the site.

VD feels that it should be easy to obtain the information missing.

WW asked if anyone had the original Site Plan that was approved for this site?

VD asked how long it would take to revise the plans to include the items missing as stated in Phil's letter and the bylaw?

AM motions to continue the Site Plan Review for J & P Auto to January 27, 2000 @ 9:30 pm.
WW seconds. Vote of 5 (RD, PC, VD, AM and WW).

GENERAL DISCUSSION – continued

JK asks the Board if they have some direction for Phil Herr regarding his memo of October 29, 1999 regarding Maplebrook Commons and a letter to EOEA and Sec. Durand.

The Board reviewed the memo and agreed to have Phil send a letter to Secretary Durand regarding Maplebrook Commons and asking for their direction regarding this project.

MINUTES ACCEPTED

VD motions to approve the minutes from 11/11/99 meeting. PC seconds. Vote of 5 (RD, PC, VD, AM and WW).

VD motions to approve the minutes from 11/22/99 meeting with the following changes. On Page 2 where we are talking about Weston Estates and JK put "we should just put Lords aka Weston Estates..." and it should say Lorusso aka Weston Estates. AM seconds. Vote of 5 (RD, PC, VD, AM and WW).

GENERAL DISCUSSION – continued

RD mentions that he is going to speak to Denis Fraine regarding obtaining a Town Planner. I would like some input from this Board in regards to what this Board feels the Town Planner's roals and/or responsibilities should be. Do we want a Planner or an Engineer?

JK states that she has had conversations with Denis Fraine regarding this and he suggests that we retain Phil on a part time basis.

VD says that we need a Planner more than we need an Engineer. We have all these applicants paying for an independent engineer. We don't have to worry about that. We need someone to review the plans to ensure that they comply with the Zoning Bylaws and Regulations. A Planner would improve our process. He will review our Bylaws and make recommendations for revisions, he would come to the Planning Board meetings and work directly with the applicants. Phil has so much experience with this Town, he needs to convey it. Phil has said it before, "I'm not going to be here forever, you should think about that".

RD asked if the Town Planning could be the policing agent? Asked the Board members to write down what they think the Planner should be responsible for.

VD mentions a letter that Don DiMartino received from Melany Reynolds from Brookside Estates. I'm very upset with the things that she said. Even though the letter is not addressed to the Planning Board I think that we should respond to her and let her know that the Planning Board in no way reduced the bond. She has insulted us in this letter. I think we should let her know that.

AM says that she has no problem responding to Ms. Reynolds.

VD says that I think we should say something like: The Planning Board in no way reduced the amount of the bond. The bond was set on recommendation from the DPW and that the overage occurred as a result of the subcontractors that were used by the Developer.

The Board agreed to send a letter responding to the letter that Ms. Reynolds sent to Don DiMartino.

RD mentions the letter from Don DiMartino regarding Maple Street and asked JK to check with Don to make sure he is all set with the tree removal for Maple Street or does he need to come back before the Board to amend what we already agreed on.

AM moves to adjourn at 10:40 pm. WW seconds. Vote of 5 (RD, PC, VD, AM and WW).



Richard V. Dill, Chairman


Paul Chupa
Valerie J. DeAngelis
Anne M. Morse
William M. Wozniak