



TOWN OF NORTHBOROUGH PLANNING BOARD

Town Hall Offices • 63 Main Street • Northborough, MA 01532 • 508-393-5019 • 508-393-6996 Fax

Approved 6-18-09

Planning Board Meeting April 7, 2009 Northborough Library

Members Present: Rick Leif, Bob Rosenberg, Michelle Gillespie, George Pember

Others Present: Kathy Joubert, Town Planner; Fred Litchfield, Town Engineer; Bill Farnsworth, Zoning Enforcement Officer/Inspector of Buildings; Eric Lally, Theresa Capobianco, Kevin Giblin, Allan Hight, Brian Smith, Stephen Anderson, John Early, Ed Rank, Gail Parker, Fran Bakstran, Xiaoning Chen, Shengming Lin, Chris Singas, Marshall Gould, Dick Kane

Chairman Leif opened the meeting at 7:00pm.

Continued Public Hearing to consider Special Permit Common Driveway for James Vogel at 496 West Main Street

Applicant:	James Vogel
Engineer:	Quinn Engineering
Date Filed:	December 29, 2008
Decision Due:	90 days from close of hearing

The applicant requested a continuation of the public hearing via a faxed letter to Kathy Joubert from Quinn Engineering, stating they need time to file with the Conservation Commission before continuing with the Planning Board. Ms. Joubert stated the applicant and his engineer don't anticipate being ready for the April 21, 2009 meeting and are hoping they'll be ready for the May 5th meeting. They originally filed an Order of Conditions with the Conservation Commission which was denied. After the denial they worked with the Conservation Commission, revised the original plans and have filed a request for an amended Order of Conditions.

Ms. Gillespie motioned to continue the public hearing to May 5, 2009 at 7:00 pm. Mr. Rosenberg seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous to continue the public hearing.

Discussion with Jim Venincasa RE: Completion of Assabet Farm Estates subdivision roadway

At the January 6, 2009 Planning Board meeting staff brought the board members up to date on the situation with the Assabet Farm Estates subdivision. A letter was sent by the Planning Board on January 26, 2009 to the developer, James Venincasa, Signature Homes, and his father, Michael Venincasa, requesting they attend the February 3, 2009 Planning Board meeting. Michael Venincasa attended the meeting and committed James Venincasa to meet the following conditions of the Planning Board:

1. The sidewalk fee of \$4000 shall be provided to the Town prior to the March 3, 2009 Planning Board meeting;
2. He shall attend the April 7, 2009 Planning Board meeting and bring with him a signed drainage contract for that meeting. If they are unable to attend this meeting, a written report, including a copy of the signed drainage contract, sent to the Planning Board by April 3, 2009, will be sufficient; and
3. The following items, outlined in the January 29, 2009 letter from the Town Engineer shall be completed by June 15, 2009. If these items are not completed by the dates specified, the Planning Board will begin the process of acquiring the subdivision bond
 - ❖ Sidewalk repair, seeding and street trees
 - ❖ Final paving and curbing
 - ❖ Miscellaneous cleanup and adjustments
 - ❖ Final drawings, bounds and engineering
 - ❖ Offsite work (in Hudson Street)

If these items were not completed by the dates specified, the Planning Board would begin the process of acquiring the subdivision bond.

Ms. Joubert stated neither James nor Michael Venincasa is here tonight and no letter was received. Minutes before the meeting tonight she received an email from James Venincasa stating he was unable to attend the meeting due to a death in the family. In addition, he stated he was unable to proceed with the items in the Town Engineer's letter due to the bad economic times.

Ms. Joubert stated it is up to the board to decide what they want to do. The developer has not met two benchmarks, but given that he's not here tonight, she recommended continuing the discussion to the April 21st meeting and inviting Mr. Venincasa to that meeting. In the meantime, a letter will be sent to him requesting he provide documentation as to why or why not he can't comply with the conditions.

Mr. Leif stated the board has said that by February 3rd they wanted the sidewalk money and a report from James Venincasa tonight. He has not provided the report or the money. June 15th has not come yet, but he has failed to provide the other items.

Mr. Rosenberg stated it's clear that the board expected the deliverables. He doesn't see any good faith on the part of the contractor. Regardless of a death in the family, items could've been sent to the board. The contractor has failed repeatedly to fulfill his obligations to the community. If notice is to be served to the bonding company, now is the time to do it. Construction season will begin and he doesn't want to have the neighborhood have to deal with another winter because someone got by the board. He stated they need to take advantage of this.

Mr. Pember stated the board asked for a show of good faith along with a monetary contribution. He suggested the board vote to declare the contractor in default tonight.

Ms. Gillespie agreed. She stated the contractor's email message was just received tonight. She stated they should pull the bond.

Ms. Joubert stated the first thing to do is to vote to find the developer in default of the subdivision decision and from there, she will send a letter to the insurance company informing them of the board's decision.

Ms. Gillespie motioned that the board find James Venincasa, aka Signature Homes, aka, Assabet Farm Builders in default of the subdivision decision for Assabet Farm Estates and that the board authorize the Town Planner to start the process of pulling the bond as directed by Town Counsel. Mr. Pember seconded the motion and the vote was unanimously in favor.

Public hearing to consider new zoning bylaw Chapter 7 to replace existing Chapter 7 and new zoning map dated April 2009 to replace existing zoning map dated October 1975.

Chairman Leif read the legal ad for this public hearing.

Mr. Leif presented an informational slide show (attached) entitled "2009 Zoning Bylaw Revision", which gave an overview of the zoning changes proposed for approval at Town Meeting in April. He stated any changes to the proposed bylaw from tonight's meeting will be made as amendments on Town Meeting floor.

After the slideshow presentation, Mr. Leif asked for comments from the audience.

Eric Lally, 2 Dartmouth Drive, asked if they looked at other towns and their growth plans during the zoning reorganization process.

Mr. Leif explained they worked with a consultant, Judi Barrett from Community Opportunities Group, who has worked with many towns. The concept for the center of town developed through the process with no particular town as a model.

Ms. Gillespie stated Ms. Barrett would note things from different towns when the subject was brought up. She would give them examples of how other towns do specific things.

Chris Singas, 12 Main Street, asked what the setback is for a building from the street in the downtown business district.

Ms. Joubert stated the proposed setback is 6 feet with a maximum of 20 feet. Currently it is 6 feet with no maximum setback. The proposed bylaw is introducing the maximum setback.

Theresa Capobianco, 34 Samuel Gamely Road, asked if there is a minimum amount of green space required in the downtown business district.

Ms. Joubert stated open space is not required on the small downtown lots but landscaping is part of the requirements.

Brian Smith, 97 Main Street, stated one group of citizens has been following this process and they have had problems with parts of it. They have recommendations for amendments, but he's not going into details as to why. He suggested people could go to their website at www.northboroughzoning.org.

Mr. Smith stated in general there are 3 areas they are concerned with, which include multifamily housing by right and by special permit in Main Street Residential, Business B West and the Downtown Business district, any maximum setback requirement on Main Street, and any change by special permit from one nonconforming use to another - specifically the 77

Main Street property and Stop & Shop. Mr. Smith stated current zoning does not allow change from one nonconforming use to another and the proposed would allow a change from industrial use to residential. Right now, Stop & Shop can't use the driveway, which may be a future legal fight with Stop & Shop.

Ms. Joubert asked Mr. Smith if he intended to present the concerns of the group in written form.

Mr. Smith stated he will.

Mr. Leif stated they have already had many discussions with Mr. Smith about his concerns about multifamily housing and maximum setback on Main Street. Regarding nonconforming uses, under current zoning it does not allow any nonconforming use to be changed to another nonconforming use. Once an existing use ceases the use reverts to the natural use of the zone, which is residential for the 77 Main Street property. No provisions have been proposed to allow that by special permit. The current zoning allows this by special permit from the Zoning Board of Appeals at their discretion.

Ms. Joubert stated Stop & Shop is allowed to use the driveway.

Mr. Smith stated the driveway issue hasn't been to Land Court.

Mr. Leif stated if the opinion from Town Counsel that Stop & Shop is allowed to use the driveway was overturned in the future, the proposed zoning does allow something to happen that couldn't have happened before.

Mr. Smith stated it takes away the opportunity for a legal defense.

Ms. Joubert reminded those present that pre-existing, nonconforming use is governed by state law and not something unique to Northborough.

John Early, 23 Samuel Gamwel Road, asked what the proposed largest size of a building is that is allowed in the Business East district and what it is currently in the Business West district.

Mr. Leif stated in proposed Business East it's up to 15,000 square feet by right and 25,000 square feet by special permit. Business B currently sets no size limit.

Mr. Early stated the proposed downtown area has a village atmosphere, but it seems as though Business East zoning allows buildings half of size of what is allowed in Business West. He asked about the rationale behind this.

Mr. Leif stated Route 20 has residential areas and it made sense and seemed appropriate to allow larger buildings in Business East and then larger buildings in Business West than in Business East, especially as it leads to the Southwest area.

Mr. Early asked if they had thoughts of making it smaller on the west side.

Mr. Leif stated that, looking at the town overall, there needed to be the ability to site business of different sizes. They tried to manage down the commercial use in west to balance it with the residential use.

Mr. Early stated there is a lot of residential area there and he sees the proposed building sizes as too large for business and commercial uses near residential areas. The maximum allowed by special permit would be 3 times the size of the new CVS.

Mr. Farnsworth stated the building at 290 West Main Street is approximately 20,000 square feet.

Ms. Joubert stated she understands the concerns about size limits, but asked those present to keep in mind there are currently no size limits. The Board has been looking at how the east and west areas have developed. They have the same zoning, but there are smaller sized developments in the east. Lots tend to be smaller in the east. The proposed zoning echoes that. In the west, existing developments include Maney's Plaza, Times Square, Fox Meadow, Pendleton Square and the new building at 290 West Main Street. From these buildings, the boards got the parameters for the proposed allowed building sizes in the west.

Mr. Early asked if retail drive-through service was allowed in the proposed bylaw.

Mr. Leif stated it is not allowed in the downtown area, but it is allowed by special permit in Business East and West.

Ed Rank, 27 Samuel Gamwel Road, asked what the maximum setback is for the Maney Plaza. He stated Rocky's Ace Hardware is not all the way back. There is swampy area and a neighborhood behind the plaza. He questioned if it would be possible for some residential areas to end up with factories in their back yards.

Mr. Leif stated the proposed zoning provides setbacks and abutting zones would not see buildings right up against neighborhood areas.

Ms. Joubert noted that in abutting Chatfield Notch, the boundary line of today's present business zone and what is proposed is staying the same. It will not encroach anymore than it is today. She stated she doesn't know who owns the large lot, but the back of Maney's Plaza is all wet and that is why it hasn't been, and probably will never be, developed.

Mr. Pember stated when they first started the project, they were strict about following lot lines and some lot lines came right up to residential neighborhoods. They didn't want to see that kind of encroachment on neighborhoods, so they brought some lines back to where they'd been.

Mr. Farnsworth stated with Rocky's Ace Hardware and Lowe's, it is probably 1.5 times larger than 15,000 square feet.

Steve Anderson, 26 Stratton Way, state he has spoken with some neighbors about the Main Street Business East zoning and has a signed petition from them which makes reference to the White Cliffs property at 167 Main Street. It is currently a split lot, with a portion zoned commercial and a part zoned residential. There is more residential area than commercial and the proposed zoning will make it all commercial. Given the size of commercial development that will be allowed in the area, the residents are concerned about the possibility of a large development locating in their backyards. He asked the board to consider leaving the zoning line where it is now or changing the whole lot to residential use. On the zoning map there's an office building near the front of the White Cliff's property, that is commercial and the rest is residential.

Ms. Joubert explained the front portion is zoned Business B and back is Residential C. Mr. Anderson is suggesting the blue Business B East area on the proposed zoning map be brought back to the current boundary line.

Mr. Anderson stated some of the area in blue also includes the dental building.

Ms. Joubert stated she has suggested to everyone to bring forth their individual changes and if the board is in agreement with the changes proposed, they would incorporate it into their amendment for Town Meeting floor. It would be included in the board's presentation and a new motion would be read at Town Meeting to include the changes the board agrees upon. If the board doesn't agree with some of the changes, those people would have the option to do it at town meeting. The public hearing was opened tonight and may be continued to April 21st, at which time the board would decide what they want to bring to Town Meeting.

Ms. Gillespie asked if it is possible to make the whole lot residential. She asked Mr. Anderson what he will propose to the board.

Mr. Anderson stated all residential is fine with him, or the split lot is fine, also.

Mr. Gould stated that as a representative of the owner of the dental building, he understands what Mr. Anderson is saying, but to come all the way up to Main Street would contradict what the board is trying to do. It's not going to allow the entire use of the back lot. He is sensitive to the neighbors, but the area is not a prime residential setting and the town would be losing tax interest. He asks the board to consider going with the split lot instead of making it all residential.

Mr. Gould presented a memorandum to the board and explained his comments on the proposed bylaw as follows:

MEMORANDUM

PROPOSED NORTHBOROUGH ZONING BYLAW FOR ANNUAL TOWN MEETING 2009

All references to page numbers, sections, or paragraphs refer to the print out of the Proposed Northborough Zoning Bylaw for Annual Town Meeting 2009

1. At the top of page 5, it states "vehicular access to a building site on the lot shall be exclusively through the frontage of the lot ...". I suggest adding "unless otherwise approved by the Zoning Board of Appeals or Planning Board".

MG Comment: Some towns have a strong preference for this. Some buildings are served better with driveway coming off other sides of the property. Some lots call for better placement of drives. Most surrounding towns have such matters in their bylaw

2. Page 5 definition of SPECIAL PERMIT: Remove words **morals, comfort and convenience**.

MG Comment: This is dangerous wording and morality can't be regulated through zoning. Public welfare will cover it.

3. Still on page 5 definition of STREET includes on line 3 "... a way determined by the Planning Board to have sufficient width, suitable grades, and adequate construction to provide for the needs of vehicular traffic in relation to the proposed use of the land, and for the installation of municipal services to serve such land and the buildings erected or to be erected thereon." This sentence will become the proposed wording on page 70, paragraph B(3) as an alternative.
4. Page 67, Section 7-07-030 MAJOR COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY DISTRICT (MCDOD). There is no definition of what is meant by "large-scale commercial development" in Paragraph A, Line 2. Obviously The Loop at over 600,000 square feet is a large scale commercial development. What about other smaller uses of 100,000 or 200,000 square feet or less? Does MCDOD allow for smaller lots in the area to be developed if they are "not large scale"?

Kevin Giblin Comment: The major commercial stores are not really defined yet. This came up because of The Shops @ 9 and 20. The issue is clearly the biggest lot is part of 9 and 20, but other lots that could be included. It's not clearly defined. Thought and flexibility need to go into it. The overlay should allow for smaller lots. If the intent is to do away with variances, there should be a paragraph addressing smaller scale or any commercial development there.

Mr. Leif noted the use regulations define allowable sizes and uses.

Mr. Gould stated he doesn't have a problem with use variances. It's the term "major", which is being used because of The Loop. Some regulations require a traffic study, but small buildings wouldn't need it. The driving range is only 33 acres, which is one-fifth the size of The Loop.

5. Page 68, D(1) and (2). Banks without drive through windows should be allowed as a matter of right without Special Permit. Anything with drive through windows, whether restaurant, bank or other, may require Special Permit

MG Comment: Banks are no different than retail and should be allowed by right. Anything with drive-thru windows could be put under special permits.

6. Page 69, G(2) MAJOR STREET INTERSECTIONS AND ROADS are not defined. Also, minimum radius of two (2) miles is too great a distance for most developments except those of very large scale. In some manner the Board must provide reasonable standards for different size developments. This should be easily developed on a project by project basis between the Board or Planner and the Developer.

MG Comment: "Major" implies a huge project. There are no other major pieces of land that would qualify for such a big scope. Residents will vote on the whole bylaw. Small projects should be done on a separate basis. Some regulations are too much for smaller project. If the board asks developers for traffic studies, there's usually no fight as to how far it should go out.

MG Comment: Page 69, 7-07-040 - This paragraph talks about a site having 200 feet of frontage on a private way. This would be on Borgatti land north of Routes 9 and 20, with the only existing frontage coming off West Main Street. The land is split by a large wetland area so there will not be a drive that goes from West Main Street to Route 20. The plan is to use a drive off The Loop road to get access. The paragraph should say 50 feet of frontage on a private way, determined by the board to provide standards required by the town. It talked about roads potentially being private, but school buses would have to go up there. The driveway system for The Loop includes roads that are larger than standard town roads so there are no problems there. The zone will never be used with a 500 foot long bridge coming off West Main Street and there won't be frontage unless Bigelow's decided to sell. We would like to see the frontage change from 200 feet to 50 feet.

Mr. Leif stated they had always wanted to do lower-cost housing in the area on the northern most part of West Main Street, to the right of Agway and Bigelows, where the driveway comes out. It's an option for more affordable housing, for home ownership at a lesser cost. This was proposed and a long-term master plan was developed for Borgatti to do retail up front and residential in back.

Mr. Giblin stated the wetlands break it up. Without changes, the wetland side will have no access. Access was always intended to come off The Loop. The road meets every state specification for commercial development. Its years away, but we want to make sure the bylaw doesn't prohibit it.

Mr. Leif asked if they would have a way, through the variance process, to address all those issues if the zoning didn't pass.

Mr. Gould replied they would. It would be the only way they could do it. They couldn't cut across 300 feet of wetlands. The land would be useless.

7. Page 70, B(3) after the words "Public Way", the sentence should continue "or two hundred (200) feet of frontage on a private way (use page 5 wording) determined by the Planning Board to have sufficient width, suitable grades, and adequate construction to provide for the needs of vehicular traffic in relation to the proposed use of the land, and for the installation of municipal services to serve such land and the buildings erected or to be erected thereon."

8. General comment pertaining to ROPOD PROCEDURE (7-07-040): The multi-step process is (1) Concept Plan; (2) Town Meeting Approval; (3) Special Permit Process; and (4) Possible State or other local board process or permits. The original concept plan, being the first step in the proceeding, should allow modifications by agreement of Board and Applicant during the entire process for the best development. Therefore, the last three (3) lines of Paragraph D on page 73 should be deleted.

MG Comment: Page 72 D (2, ROPOD procedure - Once you go to Town Meeting with concept plan, the plan cannot change, and then you go back to board for the process. As you go through the project, the original concept plan gets changed as it goes through the process. The process will be almost impossible. The original concept plan is going to change. People don't understand the process at Town Meeting and it's not the place to educate them. I have suggested the last three lines on page 73 be

deleted. It's too expensive. You're working with land options not land ownership. The concept needs flexibility. Page 73, E (3) says the same thing, and so does page 74, H (3) (a). Once everyone reviews the plan, changes may be made and it doesn't give anyone the right to change the concept plan. A skeleton plan should be done at Town Meeting.

9. For the same reasons stated immediately above, D(2)(c) on page 73 should also be deleted.
10. For the same reasons stated immediately above, the first sentence of Paragraph E(3) on page 73 should also be deleted.
11. Also on page 73, E(2), proponent shall submit twelve (12) complete copies of the Concept Plan.
12. On page 74, H(3)(a) should be modified to allow reasonable modification of Concept Plan by agreement of Planning Board and Applicant.
13. On page 75, H(3)(c) should provide more clarity if the intended land to be protected is natural open space as opposed to “developed” open space for active or passive recreational use, such as walking trails or ball fields. The Special Permit, once recorded at the Registry of Deeds, is binding upon the owner(s) and successors and assigns and may be enforced by the Town. Does the Town want to incur expense or liability for passive or active recreational areas?

MG Comment: Page 75, H (3)(c) - This has to do with open space. All of the land shown as permanent open space has to be conveyed to the town for enforcement of the rights. You really want true, untouched open space. If you have ball fields or walking trails you're going to have liabilities. You may want to change it by saying undeveloped open space in natural state.

14. On page 76, J prohibits Use Variances. Although some planners may not favor Use Variances as a means of planning, Use Variances are important tools in the more creative developments and can serve a very positive purpose. Since absolute prohibition of Use Variances limits the future potential for creative development, I would suggest the removal of this prohibition and leave the decision making on Use Variances to the appropriate board under appropriate circumstances.

MG Comment: Use variances are not best idea for zoning but they can be an important too in more creative development and in providing an important purpose. You're creating a bible and if the bible doesn't foresee everything in the future, you have to change the whole bylaw. If you prohibit use variances you inhibit creative development.

Mr. Farnsworth stated vehicle access is something we have been enforcing and doing for many years at the request of 911 emergency systems. Some houses with frontage on one side and the driveway on another side cause problems for emergency vehicles. When people call in the phone number shows the address but not the access. This happens many times and causes a

lot of problems, especially during the night. It could be done by the variance or special permit process.

Mr. Gould stated they don't have a problem with it being done by a variance. If the facts don't fit the case, it shouldn't be allowed but don't prohibit it.

Mr. Giblin the zoning is specific to 40 acres or more and one hundred or more units will be proposed. The development would be named something significant and he doubts if anyone wouldn't be able to find it. There should be special consideration for a project this size.

Mr. Smith asked what a building would look like with a ratio as high as 3.0 with height limit of 45 feet. Cambridge has a 3.0 ratio for parking zones. He asked what special circumstance would need that ratio.

Ms. Joubert stated the FAR provision for Downtown Business is 1.5.

Mr. Smith referred to page 39, stating he can't picture a 3.0 ratio.

Ms. Joubert stated the purpose was allowing that if in fact they did provide subgrade parking they would be able to build a larger building on the lot. Whether a 3.0 ratio can physically happen is a good question as driveways and sidewalks would have to be taken into consideration

Mr. Farnsworth stated that, in all fairness, there are some numbers in the bylaw that won't get there and some buildings already in town that don't get there.

Mr. Giblin had a comment on the whole process. He stated he has worked in the area for 2 generations. Routes 20 and 9 are one of the last avenues for revenue for the town. The bylaw prohibits the accumulation of lots to do something spectacular - not something big or prosperous, but like a village. If someone wanted to do a small office park on a single piece of land, this prohibits that and an additional \$300,000 in revenue. He stated he understands they want to clean up zoning, and all they've done is great, but to limit sizes in some of those areas to 25,000 square feet is not right.

Mr. Leif stated current zoning doesn't define a proposed vision clearly enough. This attempt has taken feedback from studies and residents as to how they want to see the town go. This is better than what we have and gives us time over the next 2 years to fine tune it.

Mr. Anderson stated he will submit his proposed amendment to the board.

Mr. Leif summed up the amendments from those present:

- Mr. Smith: Multi-families, maximum setback and nonconforming uses
- Mr. Early, Mr. Rank & Ms. Capobianco: Maximum business sizes in Business West
- Mr. Anderson: Redrawing White Cliff's lot line
- Mr. Gould: Southwest area
- Mr. Smith: Definition of FAR and is 3.0 ratio reasonable in downtown

Ms. Gillespie asked Mr. Early, Mr. Rank and Ms. Capobianco if they are suggesting building sizes of up to 15,000 square feet by right and 25,000 square feet by special permit in Business West.

They responded it is a reasonable solution and not unfriendly to business. It would be similar to Business East.

Ms. Gillespie asked Mr. Smith if he is suggesting the elimination of maximum setbacks for just the downtown area.

Mr. Smith said he is suggesting all maximum setbacks on Route 20 be eliminated, stating piece-meal is a poor way to do it and it's dangerous.

Fran Bakstran, 76 Cedar Hill Road, stated the proposed amendment for the White Cliffs property line makes sense. To do away with maximum setbacks completely negates all the work and study since 2004 as to what we want our town to look like. Westborough and Natick centers are beautiful. Zoning needs to be created that requires development in a manner we want to see. As far as multifamily housing, the 2004 studies say the people in town want to see alternative house - not affordable or low income. We say we want a grocery store or super market and yet the majority of us are appalled to have one in our downtown. We need to decide what it is we want - some want smaller buildings, some want bigger ones. We don't want to be another Route 9 in Framingham. We want a vibrant commercial and retail businesses but we don't want to overwhelm our community. It's important to take input and decide. The basic philosophy of this document was not walked into lightly. It's for the benefit of the community and not necessarily individual lot owners.

Ms. Gillespie stated to Mr. Smith that in essence he'd be creating a strip mall effect by eliminating maximum frontage along Route 20. The proposed zoning is an attempt to eliminate the strip mall effect.

Mr. Smith said he's lived in town for 30 years and has a different opinion. He is not opposed to building a strip mall. It makes no sense on Route 20 to cut visibility down and have pedestrians walking on small walks.

Mr. Gould stated he has sat in on many of the zoning bylaw meetings and would like to say, as a citizen of the town, he gives the board members and all those who worked on the proposed zoning, a lot of credit. It's nice to see that everyone is interested, whether we agree with everything or not. They are not getting paid for this, it is a volunteer effort and they have done a terrific job.

Mr. Rosenberg motioned to continue the public hearing to April 21, 2009 at 7:05 pm. Mr. Pember seconded the motion and the vote was unanimously in favor.

Mr. Leif stated board members need to make sure they come prepared on April 21st to go through the amendments efficiently and talk through the process of how we make those changes before April 28th.

Ms. Joubert noted there will be a handout at town meeting from Judi Barrett to assist people with the proposed zoning bylaw. She explained the Town Administrator had agreed to print copies of the whole zoning bylaw document for town meeting. However after he saw the length of it and talked with Town Counsel about it, he agreed to print Judi Barrett's summary

as a handout instead. The article was changed to say it's available in the Town Clerk's and Planning Department's office.

Ms. Bakstran noted volunteers spent a lot of time working on the new bylaw. People don't have to like the entire document, but have to agree with the concept and trust the elected officials. It doesn't have to be a perfect document and there's no reason for it to fail on tiny things that are some opinions or different philosophies.

Old/New Business

Scenic Road Application: A scenic road application for 327 Howard Street was distributed to board members and Ms. Joubert noted the applicants already took out the stone wall. They are filing after the fact because they didn't talk about it with the town first. The foundation for the house is already in.

Earth Removal Board Representative: Ms. Joubert noted Fred Philcox is interested in continuing his position as Earth Removal Board representative. Mr. Pember motioned for the Board to approve Fred Philcox's continuation as Earth Removal Board representative, Mr. Rosenberg seconded the motion and the vote was unanimously in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Grampietro
Planning Board Secretary