

# **TOWN OF STOW Planning Board**

Minutes of the February 23, 2010 Planning Board Meeting.

Present:

Planning Board Members: Kathleen Willis, Lori Clark, Steve Quinn, Ernie Dodd, Lenny Golder

Planning Coordinator: Karen Kelleher

Administrative Assistant: Kristen Domurad

The meeting was called to order at 7P.M.

## **MINUTES AND COORESPONDENCE**

### **MINUTES**

The Board will address the meeting minutes of January 26, 2010, February 2, 2010 and February 9, 2010 at their next meeting. In the meantime board members will give Kristen Domurad their individual edits for correction.

### **COORESPONDENCE**

Karen Kelleher noted additional information was provided from the Board of Health regarding the Elementary School Building.

### **MA Downtown Initiative Workshop**

Kathleen Willis and Ernie Dodd both asked to be signed up for this event.

### **Annual CTPC Conference**

Karen Kelleher reminded the Board to let her know who would like to attend and which sessions they would like to be signed up for.

### **Worcester Business Journal Article on Sweeney Property**

Karen noted the timeline mentioned in the article for Mass Housing's decision on Site Eligibility (2-3 months) seemed longer than she expected.

### **GENERAL PUBLIC INPUT**

No public input at this time

### **PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS' UPDATES**

#### **Elementary School Building Committee (ESBC)**

Steve Quinn said the ESBC would be coming in front of the Planning Board in a few minutes to present the preliminary plans in a Public Hearing.

He reported that the ESBC voted last night to authorize the project to be posted next week for the pre-qualifications of bidders. He stated that contractors would apply for pre-qualification based on state-guidelines. This is the first step in going out to bid.

#### **Master Plan Committee**

Kathleen Willis stated the committee would meet Wednesday evening to go over a completed draft. They are looking forward to a release of the draft within two weeks followed by a 30-day comment period.

Ernie Dodd asked how many other Boards were involved with the on going draft comments. Karen Kelleher told him the Conservation Commission, Stow Affordable Housing Trust, and Board of Selectmen were involved.

#### Pedestrian Walkway Planning Sub-Committee

Lori Clark updated the Board on the progress of the committee. She said they met with Bruce Fletcher and Mike Clayton individually to walk around the upper common and get their specific ideas about existing parking layout and proposed walkway locations.

The committee also met with Tim Allaire from the Stow Recreation Implementation team. He expressed interest in helping fundraise and provided information about contractors they had used for their project.

Lori said that Kristina Wile would also be meeting with Sergeant Lima for a safety perspective to address the concerns expressed during their presentation at the Planning Board meeting.

Lori Clark said the group is beginning to draft a scope of work and identify contractors for design plans.

Karen Kelleher mentioned Habitech still owes the town a sidewalk from Hudson Road to the Villages at Stow and a donation in lieu of a sidewalk on the west side of the Villages at Stow.

#### **COORDINATOR'S REPORT**

Karen Kelleher updated the Board of the on going activities in the Planning Department.

#### Chapter 61 Evaluation Group

Karen Kelleher reported that the evaluation group met earlier that day. Members of the group include Vin Antil (Open Space), John Bolton (Assessors), Betty Cormier (Health), Karen Kelleher (Planning), Susan McLaughlin (Selectmen), Pat Perry (Conservation), and Dwight Sipler (Agriculture). Appointments made were: Vin Antil-Chair, Betty Cormier-Vice Chair.

The group agreed the Selectmen's office would scan and distribute a copy of notices to the group upon receipt, rather than waiting for the selectmen to determine if it proper notice. The Selectmen's office will provide administrative support and the group will request the Assessor's office to notify them of any change in chapter 61 status, as it could be a good indicator of potential development.

They recommend Selectmen do periodic review of the land use priorities listed in the Land Use Task Force (LUTF) report – perhaps simultaneously with the Open Space and Recreation Plan.

Each evaluation group member will compile information and bring those findings to their respective boards before incorporating them into a report for the Board of Selectmen. The report will include a series of maps related to the property in question

- Aerial view with boundaries and topology
- Estimated wetland boundaries and soil qualities
- Zoning overlays, e.g. water resources district
- Ecological resources

She reported that Jon Bolton had planned to meet with the staff in the Assessors' office to relay this conversation.

Vin Antel offered to assist with map creation for these properties to be included in their report to the Selectmen.

#### Tour of Assisted Living Facility Somerville, MA

Karen reminded the Board of the tour of the affordable assisted living facility in Somerville on March 16<sup>th</sup>. The time is still being discussed and she will notify the Board once this is finalized.

#### FY 2011 Budget

Karen Kelleher notified the Board that Mike Clayton agreed to split the cost of the GPS locator unit, which will reduce the Planning budget by \$2,500.

#### Derby Woods

Karen Kelleher reported that Mark White will provide a tri-party agreement using Stow's standard form as a performance guarantee for Phase II of the Derby Woods Subdivision and will have the paperwork ready for the Planning Board's next meeting.

#### Star Tower/T-Mobile

Karen told the Board that she was notified that a letter was sent to the chairman of the Stow Historical Commission asking them for comments regarding any historical aspects on the proposed location of a cell tower facility on Wedgewood Country Club. Karen notified the Historic Commission that the site location is not within the Wireless Service Facility Overlay District.

#### Appeal by Collings, Riverview Estates

Karen notified the Board that Bob Collings filed notice with Appeals court on the judgment regarding the Riverhill Estates Subdivision. Town Counsel will forward a copy of the appeal.

#### TD Bank North

Karen relayed a message from a Stow citizen that a TD Bank North may be opening at the former gas station site in Lower Village.

Sue Carter Sullivan, Town Consultant Engineer commented on the abandoned gas station site, stating that if a bank or similar use were proposed in this area they would need potable water.

#### Ridgewood AAN

Members reviewed the draft Special Permit Modification 2 for the Ridgewood at Stow AAN.

Karen Kelleher told the Board that Harry Blackey and Bill Roop wanted to change the condition so they could begin construction before making a decision, rather than prior to commencement of site work, as drafted.

***Ernie Dodd moved to approve Modification 2 Special Permit for Ridgewood at Stow. The motion was carried by all members of the Board (Ernie Dodd, Kathleen Willis, Lori Clark, Lenny Golder, Steve Quinn).***

#### **PUBLIC HEARING**

**The Public Hearing was called to order at 7:30 P.M.**

Kathleen Willis read the Public Hearing guidelines followed by the public hearing notice.

The Board, Elementary School Building Committee members (ESBC), and engineer design team Symmes Maini & McKee Associates (SMMA) introduced themselves to the public.

Kathleen explained that she would like SMMA to present the plan, followed by comments from the Lighting Pollution Committee, Town Consulting Engineer, members of the public, then Planning Board.

James Warren of SMMA, Civil Engineer presented the project explaining the site plan.

He said they had gone through a portion of the permitting process by filing a notice of intent with the Conservation Commission because a portion of the property has delineated wetlands.

He explained that the project encompasses two phases. Phase 1 will include installing new utilities including septic, well, power and gas for the building and decommissioning the old utilities. Phase 1 will also include partial demolition of the old building and construction of the new building.

Phase 2 includes construction of the front visitors parking and parent drop off area as well as renovation of the existing school building.

James explained the new septic system would require an enhanced nitrogen loading system in accordance with Title 5. Phil Poinelli of SMMA stated the location of the well has been approved and the pump test will be done in the next few weeks.

He said the building is a Massachusetts Collaborative High Performance School (MassCHPS) and will follow environmental criteria for sustainable design. In this effort they are proposing porous pavement for the visitors parking as well as the fire lane.

A green roof on the east side of the school will be designed with the ability to add another level if needed in the future.

James said the building schedule would begin with construction this summer June 20<sup>th</sup> continuing a little over a year to complete phase 1. Once Phase 1 construction is completed they hope to complete and open Phase 2 by September 2012.

Kathleen Willis asked the Lighting Study Sub-Committee to present their comments on the plan.

Greg Troxel and Russ Willis represented the committee.

They were assured by the engineers that all lighting would be full cut off as it is part of the requirements for the MassCHP program.

Greg Troxel stated overall they found the amount of lumens to be excessive for the 17 acre parcel. They were pleased that the parking lot lighting would be put on a dual wire system so the output could be reduced when desired, but were unclear from the plan how the lighting would be used in accordance with the hours of operation.

They recommended the engineers reference the IES book and the Zone 1 criteria, which would better fit the character of Stow and allow the project to abide by the Zoning Bylaws section 3.8.1.5.1.

Greg Troxel explained that a cap of 25 lumens for the parking lot would address the problem.

They also recommended they note on the plan that, all old wall packs will be removed.

Greg Troxel said pages in the plan were missing, making it difficult for them to determine some of the information. They said not all lighting was delineated as full cut off, although this was assured.

Greg questioned if the wall packs in the back of the building would be motion sensitive, James Warren agreed to discuss this with town safety departments.

Philip Poinelli explained the intention of the lighting for the building is for a “dark sky” building, meaning all the lights would be turned off at night when appropriate.

Phil also said he spent time speaking with the electrical engineer about parking lot lighting and roadway lighting levels. They are concerned about the level of light that would be provided for people to walk and not trip on things.

Greg Troxel gave an example of lighting conditions at the Union Church across the street, stating that amount of lumens in their lot provides enough light estimating about 6 lumens per sq meter assuming ½ would end up on the parking lot and the other ½ on the grass.

Overall, Greg said he was generally happy with the approach of full cut off fixtures but the amount of lumens should be decreased. The Light Pollution Study Sub-Committee will give SMMA and the ESBC written comments by the end of this week.

Resident Joe Mishley of 419 Great Road asked how light spilled over would affect his property. SMMA assured Joe that they are following the bylaws to make sure no lighting would spill onto any abutting properties— keeping the number as close to zero as possible.

Greg Troxel did note that snow illuminates light and assumes vegetative screening would be used to address this issue.

Kathleen Willis stated that Mr. Mishley's property would most likely end up having less light spill onto his property with the new school building, than what is currently spilling over due to existing lighting.

Kathleen Willis then called upon Town Consultant Engineer, Sue Carter Sullivan to discuss her peer review of the project to the public.

Sue Carter Sullivan explained that she had reviewed her comments with James Warren but since then, has found other items to comment on.

[Sue Carter Sullivan's review is on file in the Planning Department].

Kathleen Willis then opened the meeting for comments from the public.

Malcolm Fitzpatrick of 323 Great Road voiced concern about the septic system being 9 feet above ground and its potential for break out. He asked for further investigation on the swale at the backside of the proposed septic. He also asked if testing had been done, as there is an existing septic system in its location.

James Warren said they had drilled 4 perk tests and found till material. They are doing everything to meet the requirements of Title 5. James said they did not test for nutrient levels in the soil but are not required to.

Craig Martin, Town Building Commissioner and an ESBC member, explained there will be an enhanced nitrogen removal system with a recirculation sand filter fully compliant with Title 5.

Ernie Dodd said the language in the maintenance plan should be changed, because Craig Martin is not the person in charge of maintenance of the school facility.

Ellen Sturgis said ESBC and SMMA will be meeting with the Board of Health to go over the septic and well requirements this week and have a hearing scheduled for March 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010 she suggested Malcolm Fitzpatrick attend.

Resident Malcolm Fitzpatrick also asked about the effectiveness of the porous pavement for the visitors parking and fire lane.

Sue Carter Sullivan explained how they are very effective if maintained properly and more information about this could be found at the UNH website.

Resident Joe Mishley asked which direction the ground water infusion would be. James Warren explained the porous pavement is designed for vertical water infusion.

Resident Jon O'Connor from 418 Great Road asked how this would impact his property because he lives downstream from a small river, which is effected by rainfall from across the street.

James Warren explained the storm water drainage system is based on the town's requirement of a 100-year storm event and the system is designed to mitigate peak volume.

Sue Carter said elevation of infiltration may need to be revisited. She said the storm water requires 80% of total suspended solids to be absorbed onsite and the applicant has addressed this.

Karen Kelleher suggested the applicant provide extra copies of all application materials to be put in the library on reserve for residents in addition to the copies in the Planning Board office. The applicants also agreed to send an electronic copy of the plans.

Resident Janet Stiles 59 Pine Point Rd. voiced concern about gridlock on Route 117 and said all efforts should be made to discourage congestion. She felt the location of the parking and queuing in the entrance off Route 117 would aggravate the existing traffic conditions on Route 117.

She also felt the proximity of the proposed parking lot and bus entrance to the fire station will cause a safety issue off Hartley Road.

Janet Stiles advocated for saving the Larsen Stone Apple Barn stating the Master Plan asks for the preservation of historic spaces and landscapes. She said this barn is part of Stow's history and provides character. Janet also felt the apple barn and blacksmith shop help Stow's economy because people travel to come see historic building.

Resident Victoria Fletcher of 10 White Pond Road spoke in favor of keeping the apple barn. She stated the stone apple barn has not been shown on any plans for a while and reported that a petition for the ESBC to consider alternative site plans retaining the stone apple barn has been circulating. [Victoria then displayed with a clear overlay where the apple barn is.] Victoria said the apple barn only encroaches minimally on the proposed parking lot (6 spaces and the 24 ft. access road) and if it were lined up differently within it, just a slight change to a 14ft. access road it would not impact the playground. She said the parking spaces could be put else where on the site and the apple barn is small compared to the amount of space on the site.

Victoria stated the view of Stow center without the anchor of the stone apple building would take away from the historic view. She said it is not just about the school or the apple building or the history of that particular building, it is about the character of the community as a whole and with the hopes the design be looked at more critically to preserve the building.

Resident Malcolm Fitzpatrick of 323 Great Road agreed with Victoria that Stow is loosing its sense of place and the town should maintain the quality of their history. He felt if the building was left it would not cost anything to maintain it and doesn't think the state would object to a better site plan.

Resident Bruce Fletcher of 132 South Acton Road read a letter he wrote for the public hearing in support of preserving the Stone Building. [Letter Attached]

Ellen Sturgis, ESBC member explained the process of the project and where it currently stands. She said they had been through an extensive process with several meetings. Ellen said resident's priorities in the beginning were focused on keeping the existing gymnasium entrance with the pillars because of their attachment to this landscape at the entrance of town center. Ellen stated that the MSBA

pushed back hard on renovating this building. She stated that they worked hard to keep it in the plan and never heard anything at this time about keeping the stone apple barn.

Ellen stated they had been told the Stow Historic Commission had taken a vote to move the blacksmith shop. The ESBC also submitted several design ideas with and without the stone apple barn. The committee found that keeping the apple barn would require them to bring it up to current building codes, which would be extremely expensive. Ellen said they wanted to make the best use of the town's funds for a school the town would be proud of.

In response to Victoria Fletcher's comment she stated the site for the school building may sound large but most of the site is restrictive due to wetlands.

Ellen said the Massachusetts Historic Commission did not feel the apple barn had enough historical significance. She stated that the ESBC didn't feel it would be safe to close up the building and keeping it would interfere with the safety of the parking lot design and parent drop off design.

Ellen said last night the ESBC met with two members of the Historic Commission and came to a consensus on a way to memorialize the apple barn. She said they would incorporate the sundial into the side of the gym. She said the committee felt they made the right decision and it was not done quickly.

Resident Susan McLaughlin of 770 Great Road and member of the Stow Historic Commission said regardless of how the topic has developed, and putting any contention behind them, she felt there was still an opportunity for the building to be saved with an amended design. Susan said she had not of heard anything to persuade her otherwise and saw a SMMA design sketch incorporating the stone apple barn. Susan said her son remembers the barn fondly and said the building was state of the art when it was first built. She hoped the Planning Board would ask for an amendment to the plan.

Resident Nancy Arsenault of 267 Red Acre Road asked if parking spaces and the parent drop off area were reconfigured, would cause a change of scope plan.

Ellen Sturgis said the change would not have an impact on the reimbursement rate but would cause a delay in the redesigning of the site. In addition, she explained, it would change the scope and would have to go back to the MSBA board of directors.

Resident Janet Stiles spoke about how the apple barn is unique to the state because it is a vernacular building; all the stones come from Stow and is still in Stow. Janet said she wanted to debunk the myth that the timetable was very short, because June 20<sup>th</sup> was the first meeting of the ESBC and they chose the plan without the apple barn and communicated to the town that it was not a good idea to keep it.

Resident Lew Halprin of 82 Pine Point Road recommended the apple barn be made into a memorial for the town. He said Massachusetts Historical Commission did not deem the building historical for their registry but it does not mean Stow does not find it historically significant. He said it is a unique building; the only one of it's kind in New England. He suggested the building be boarded up for the time being, and then later become a part of a Stow Historical park including the blacksmith shop. He said keeping the barn would save the town the cost of tearing it down.

Resident and Selectmen, Kathy Farrell of 267 Sudbury Road said many constituents have called asking her to advocate the importance of the apple barn and to relay this to the Planning Board. Kathy said people in town expect that the democratic process would be upheld. She said since it is a phased project there is a way to protect the town's heritage and renovate the school building.

Resident Malcolm Fitzpatrick said he too wanted to debunk a myth that everyone in town knows about the meetings that go on. He said although the meetings are posted, people who are involved tend to know more about the happenings of other committees and boards. He said he should have inquired sooner but

does not think it is a reason they shouldn't revisit the problem now. He said every effort should be made to save the barn.

Ellen said there were a lot of people at the ESBC meetings, 80-100 people who did not express their interest in the stone building. Ellen stressed changing the plan at this point would change the time line, delaying the project for about a year.

Malcolm Fitzpatrick hoped that the stone building could be added into the modification of parking spaces that need to be addressed due to spaces lost on Hartley Road for where the septic systems is proposed. Ellen Sturgis said the replacement of overflow parking from Hale Middle School event would be the new staff parking lot.

Kathleen Willis asked if they are starting construction in June, could they have a new plan done by the end of February.

Ellen Sturgis explained they are to go out to bid the first day of May. She said the construction documents are 70% done and any delay would require them to resubmit plans for approval by the MSBA. Ellen said if the project was delayed by 6 weeks they could not start construction in June and several parts of Phase 1 need to be done when the children are not in school.

Lori Clark asked the ESBC if the time constraint was in the creation of making an alternative plan or the approval process with MSBA. Ellen Sturgis said the entire process could take 60-90 days and everyone would need to agree with the architects plans then the MSBA would be a 2 month notice, followed by 5 months decision so it was a hypothetical time frame when they guessed 10-12 months.

Paul Griffin, Owner's Project Manager, said if delayed the town would miss the summer window. He said the MSBA only meets every other month.

Resident Malcolm Fitzpatrick said the building would not have an impact if it is left standing in existence because there are no utilities going on that part of the site.

Paul Griffin stated that the ESBC couldn't bid out one phase at a time they have to bid out the entire project together.

He also stated, if the scope of the plans are changed, they need to go back to the MSBA for approval before going out to bid.

Resident Victoria Fletcher stated because of the phase construction, the building could stay for the time being, and said no one suggested the building be used for school purposes. She suggested the only delay was due to the ESBC's reluctance to look at an alternative plan when the issue arose, which they knew people were asking about it in November and had done nothing about it.

Resident Janet Stiles said that the permitting requirement from the Massachusetts Historical Commission came back within 10 days and suggested that like this state agency the MSBA would also be willing to work with the ESBC to give the town the school they want.

Paul Griffin agreed with Janet Stiles that the MSBA takes into account what they towns want to see for their school design, but he said that the town had an opportunity to do so at town meeting.

Paul said he received a call from the MSBA stating that any change in scope would send them back to the approval board. He did not think the MSBA would raise the issue of keeping the stone apple barn to level of importance the residents at the meeting feel.



Resident Joe Mishley of 419 Great Road said that an article in the Stow Independent read there was a 1954 town meeting, which stated the stone apple barn, is not to be sold nor removed and the town had never rescinded this vote.

Paul Griffin said the ESBC spoke with town counsel about this issue and he stated that the October Town Meeting removed this prior vote so it is considered rescinded.

A member of the Stow Historical Commission stated they were unaware of the meeting that took place the other night between two Stow Historical Commission members and the ESBC.

Resident Lew Halprin stated that Town Counsel's opinion was based on the fact that the 1953 article was not followed through by putting anything in the deed. Legally it could be discussed as to whether it was true or not. Lew said although funds were approved for the new school, there was no reason why a citizen petition could not come up next meeting to null the vote.

Karen Kelleher asked the ESBC if the Planning Board required an amendment for parking or something similar, would they be required to go back to the MSBA for scope approval.

Paul Griffin said there is a difference between amendment and scopes. He said MSBA would not consider parking amendments or other small changes like lighting to be a change in scope. They would require further approval in order to keep the stone apple barn. Any building change would be considered a scope change.

Paul said the MSBC asked them six months ago if this plan was indeed what the town wanted and they contacted him the night before the hearing to tell him specifically that keeping stone apple barn would be a change in scope.

Resident Susan McLaughlin asked the Planning Board to contact MSBA themselves to get an understanding of what a change of scope would be from the MSBA and to find out how difficult it would be to make one.

Resident, Nancy Arsenault of 267 Red Acre Rd. and Stow Independent Co-Owner and Staff Writer said she spoke with the MSBA press secretary who advised her that keeping the stone apple barn would be a change in scope and would require review estimated at 6-9 months.

Resident Malcolm Fitzpatrick stated he did not feel the town meeting vote allowed for appropriate discussion of the actual site plan. He stated that there was a 30 minute discussion, in which he was about to bring up the stone apple barn but was not allowed time to speak.

Ellen Sturgis asked if the Planning Board could clarify their roll in discussing the Stone Apple Barn in their site review.

Kathleen Willis explained that under the site plan approval the Planning Board is supposed to consider preserving historic features and protecting community's amenities. Kathleen explained she felt this discussion was within the bounds of what the public hearing allows so those concerns should be heard.

Kathleen Willis asked if there were any new items of concern not addressed by residents.

Resident Dorothy Sonnichsen of 101 Packard Road agreed with everyone that is in favor of saving the stone apple barn for reasons stated.

Resident Janet Stiles wanted to document that during the vote at October Town Meeting they were told that no amendments would be allowed.

Ellen Sturgis stated that this was the MSBA's requirement not the town's choice.

Kathleen Willis then turned to the Planning Board for comments.

Ernie Dodd stated that he did not necessarily agree that Town Meeting vote was for the whole design of the project, he thought it was just for the funding. Ernie also said that Planning Board members brought up this issue 3 months ago because they were concerned with the funding and timeline being pushed back by the Massachusetts Historical Commission. Ernie said the same excuse was made then about the timeline being pushed back.

He also noted that Community Preservation funds were used to stabilize the Blacksmith shop and did not believe it could be torn down. Ernie would like to see a design to save the stone building and provide additional parking on the north side to make up some of the differences from the 100 to 109 parking spaces. Ernie said this was his personal opinion but restated the Planning Board did mention this problem several months ago.

Ellen Sturgis said that the ESBC did consider other options but they felt that the options with the stone apple barn were not the best options. She said they were listening to others that wanted to keep the building but they did not agree that the building should stay. She said the ESBC was charged with making these decisions and felt it would be cheaper at this point to tear the building down.

Kathleen Willis asked if they are providing the required number of parking spaces. She said the Board wants to make sure that the correct amount of parking is provided.

Phil Poineli said they would be going to the ZBA because they have proposed less parking than the bylaw requires. He stated that in almost every case parking spaces are excessive in towns' bylaws compared to what is needed and they don't want to over build in order to save cost. SMMA is prepared to go to the ZBA for relief in parking requirements because they believe it is the right amount for the site.

Ernie Dodd said they will need to request a variance from the ZBA for parking but did not think they would need a variance for the flood plain because the bylaw goes by the FEMA map.

James Warren thought it was a procedural step due the interpretation of the language in the bylaw.

Karen Kelleher said it wouldn't hurt to clarify this with the ZBA but is not required by the Bylaw.

Lori Clark questioned the width of the one-way parent drop off driveway.

James Warren explained there is a dual purpose, queuing for parents, and allows for emergency egress for event parking. James also said that the width is to accommodate shoulder parking for parents. He explained that the road is designed for flexibility.

Ernie Dodd said that they do require a 24ft road for in and out driveways but this is for a one-way drive.

Resident Malcolm Fitzpatrick felt that 24ft is excessive for slow moving traffic and the inner parking lot should be redesigned.

Kathleen Willis asked if parents will still be queuing and parking on Route 117.

Ellen Sturgis said the idea behind the width of the proposed drop off is to get parents off Route 117.

Philip Poinelli said that there is queuing space for 40 cars, 17 parking spaces. A total of 57 spaces in for queuing.

Sue Carter Sullivan mentioned some reasons for the wider lanes could be for snow plowing and the width will also allow for doors to be opened fully for children in car seats.

James Warren stated that the width is designed for a broad radius and for truck deliveries, which is on the west side of the building. He also said it will give parents flexibility when they pick their children up.

Lori Clark was concerned that if they build the parent drop-off in a way that allows parents too much flexibility it could create unwanted traffic issues or chaos.

Kathleen Willis asked about focusing parent drop off for Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten off Hartley Road.

Philip Poinelli said that this would create grid lock with the buses and encouraging parents to break this law.

As a side note, Ellen Sturgis said the language of the town meeting vote does encompass taking the stone apple barn down.

Steve Quinn asked James Warren where they were on the traffic report.

James Warren said they would like some time to address Sue Carter Sullivan's response before having another peer-review. Steve was concerned about the time this would take.

Kathleen Willis encouraged the ESBC and SMMA to consider more screening. Sue had also mentioned this to SMMA and will be working on this.

Kathleen also mentioned prior concerns of public safety officers about screening and hopes that they will be able to speak to them about this to appease any issues in advance.

James Warren said the intent of the screening was to utilize the existing natural buffer.

Kathleen said more needs to be added around the parking lot and additional shrubs would help. She also stated the Board needs to conduct a site walk to see what existing foliage will remain.

Philip Poinelli said they are concerned about receiving the Planning Boards comments and input in a timely manner.

Lenny Golder asked if the project will meet their deadlines seeing as they still need to meet and receive comments from the ZBA and Conservation Commission.

Paul Griffin said meeting with the Boards has nothing to do with the overall contract schedule.

Ellen Sturgis stated that they have built space into their timeline for the public hearings and responses from the Boards.

Paul Griffin said the MSBC made it very clear that they need to know if the stone building is staying or going before they sign the contract because they have several project where people have boarded up a building and then open them up after the construction is completed. They are able to keep the blacksmith shop on the site because it will be moved.

Ernie Dodd asked why they couldn't design the plans as if the stone building is never to be opened and then address it at a later date.

Malcolm Fitzpatrick asked why they could not be treated the same.

Ellen Sturgis said they have an agreement that the blacksmith shop has to be moved and cannot stay on the site and will be moved – but it is also in the original scope.

Malcolm Fitzpatrick questioned what the original scope looks like.

Paul Griffin reminded residents that the money from the MSBC is a grant and there are requirements that must be met. He said there are a lot of schools in the pipeline waiting to be funded; hence the MSBC is very regimented in order to be fair to all communities. If a town wants to change scoped plans they require towns to come back to their board.

Susan McLaughlin requested again that the Planning Board ask MSBC about the context of the stone apple barn and the implications changing the this aspect and what a scope change is.

Ellen Sturgis said that people don't like what they are hearing and they are not trusting what the committee and professionals have been charged or hired to do.

Philip Poinelli said SMMA deals with the MSBC all the time and they are giving their best advice based on their experience and knowledge of the MSBA Board.

Kathleen Willis said the Board comments will most likely take another hour or two and they could continue the public hearing to next week as long as there were no new items the public wanted to discuss that night.

***Ernie Dodd motioned to continue the public hearing on the Stow Elementary School Building Special Permit application to Wednesday March 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2010 for the purpose of focusing on Planning Board comments. The motion was seconded by Steve Quinn and carried a vote of five in favor (Ernie Dodd, Steve Quinn, Kathleen Willis, Lori Clark, Lenny Golder).***

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Kristen Domurad