

The March 11, 2015 meeting of the Walpole Zoning Board of Appeals was held in the Main Meeting Room of the Town Hall.

Chairman Matthew Zuker called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m. with the following members present:

Matthew Zuker, Chairman  
James DeCelle, Vice Chairman  
Craig W. Hiltz, Clerk  
Mary Jane Coffey, Member (not present)  
Susanne Murphy, Member (not present)  
Timothy Foley, Associate Member

Also Present:  
Ilana Quirk, Town Counsel  
Margaret Walker, Town Engineer  
Liz Dennehy, Director of Community & Economic Development  
John Chessia, Chessia Consulting Services, LLC

Mr. Zuker declared the Board will be going into Executive Session to discuss litigation strategy known as 5<sup>th</sup> Fairway Development, LLC v. Walpole Zoning Board of Appeals, Housing Appeals Committee No. 2009-09, involving a proposed 40B Comprehensive Permit for land on Baker Street and to discuss litigation strategy regarding litigation known as Barberry Homes LLC v. Walpole Zoning Board of Appeals, Housing Appeals Committee No. 2014-01; and Town of Walpole, et al. v Barberry Homes, LLC, Land Court 2014 MISC 481399-AHS and Robertson v. Barberry Homes, LLC, Norfolk Superior Court NOCV2014-000129 involving a proposed 40B Comprehensive Permit for land on Moose Hill Road. A discussion of the foregoing in open session could compromise the purpose for the executive session. He further stated the board will return to open session at the conclusion of the executive session.

A motion was made by Mr. DeCelle, seconded by Mr. Hiltz, to go into executive session, under G.L. c.30A, §21 (a)(3), for the purposes and reasons declared by Chairman and with the Zoning Board of Appeals to return to open session thereafter.

The vote was **4-0-0 in favor. (Mr. Zuker – Yes; Mr. DeCelle – Yes; Mr. Hiltz – Yes; Mr. Foley – Yes)**

The Board returned to open session at 7:09 p.m.

**7:00 p.m. – Barberry Homes, LLC – Case #21-13 (cont'd from 2/5/15) (Zuker, DeCelle, Hiltz, Foley)**

Matthew Zuker read the Public Hearing notice for **BARBERRY HOMES, LLC, Case #21-13**, with respect to property located at 272 Moose Hill Road, East Walpole, MA, which consist of approximately 14.33 acres, as shown on Assessors Map 36 as Lot Nos. 66, 66-1, 62 and is located in the Residence A Zone, to obtain a comprehensive permit under G.L. c.40B in order to allow construction of a rental project with 157 units, 25% of which shall be affordable units.

The application and revised plans are on file with the office of the Board of Appeals at the Walpole Town Hall.

Mr. Zuker stated that the Board had continued the last meeting for the purpose of looking over revised plans. The last Zoning Board meeting regarding the Applicant was February 5, 2015. Tonight we have both the Town Engineer Maggie Walker and John Chessia from Chessia Consulting Services, LLC. At this time we will turn it over to the Applicant.

Mr. Adam Costa, attorney for the Applicant stated that they were before the board about a month ago. We had our project team in attendance. We focused on site design, traffic and parking. We had our traffic consultant in attendance. We would like to ask our traffic consultant to speak now.

Town Counsel Ilana Quirk asked the applicant if they could interrupt for just one quick moment to address something.

Mr. Zuker wanted to note that the applicant would be proceeding with a 4 member board. The board has offered to continue to a later date if you would like a 5 member board.

Attorney Costa stated that they understood appreciated the town for informing them previously and have elected to proceed tonight with the 4 member board.

Mr. Jason Sobel the transportation engineer for Green International (traffic consultant for the applicant) said that the Applicant has requested 2 waivers in regards to parking. The first waiver has to do with the number of parking spaces on site. As mentioned previously we have 1.89 parking spaces per unit as opposed to 2. He went on to explain that they have viewed a document called the ITE parking report. The data in the ITE states that the peak parking demand equates to 1.23 per unit which is well below what we require. Not every site is exactly the same. It correlates with the number of bedrooms at each site. The Applicant's site is just 1 and 2 bedroom units. The Applicants site is at 1.89 spaces per unit currently which according to the ITE report would be sufficient. In addition to the national data, we have also found a local comparison. We looked into the Avalon in Sharon. It is located just a little bit away from this site. After some research we found that it is almost identical to the number of units, we had a conversation with the Town of Sharon Police Department and we also talked with someone in the Avalon Sharon leasing office as well. They both stated that they are happy with the number of spaces the complex offers.

Mr. Sobel continued and stated that the next waiver they are requesting has to do with the parking space dimensions, both the size of the spaces themselves and the aisle width. The town is asking for 25 foot wide aisles and the applicant is proposing 24 foot aisles. We spoke with the Town of Sharon regarding the Avalon and they stated that they also have 18 foot wide spaces with 24 foot aisles and have had no issues.

Mr. Zuker thanked Mr. Sobel and stated we asked you to find a comparable place which you did. We appreciate that. He went onto state that he believes that the neighbors are nervous regarding

the possibility of residents or guest parking along Moose Hill Road. He stated that his biggest concern is that they have the right number because he doesn't want to cause a problem in the neighborhood.

Ms. Walker asked if the Applicant had looked into the fact that there was no other guest parking. It seems you are saying that there will be enough spaces however I know the neighbors had concerns.

Mr. Zuker noted that you also have to consider handicap spaces. That does take away from the other spaces. He stated that he does not see a problem with the 1.89 space per unit. Having some confirmation from a peer reviewer would be helpful.

Ms. Walker said that she had requested some quotes from a peer reviewer and depending on what the board would like to review would determine the price.

Mr. Costa explained that they will provide one sticker per unit. They will then sell an additional sticker if the tenant needs it. He stated that he has permission from his client to fund any peer review the town might want to implement. They are confident with those numbers.

Mr. Zuker stated that he felt comfortable with the 1.89 spaces per unit.

Mr. Costa stated that they would like that peer review to happen sooner rather than later and they would be happy to fund that review.

Mr. Hiltz mentioned that he did not recall seeing anything from Walpole Police or Walpole Fire that there would be an issue.

Mr. Foley said in going back to the comparison with Avalon in Sharon. Does the Applicant know if they had assigned parking or was it a permit. Did they have parking designated for visitors?

Mr. Sobel stated that the Avalon Sharon does not have assigned parking. There are 30 additional spaces designated for visitors.

Mr. Zuker asked if the Applicant was going to assign parking spaces.

Mr. Costa stated that there will not be assigned parking.

Mr. Sobel stated that we did look at the stopping site distance on Moose Hill Road. We have sufficient stop distance. Going north bound we have even more. The stopping site distance is for safety. The intersection site distance is more for convenience.

Mr. Zuker stated that the Board wants to make this as safe as possible.

Mr. Sobel said if someone is travelling at 35 MPH on Moose Hill Road they will have to slow down to 25 MPH. Traffic on Moose Hill is generally low. We would also recommend that no trees be added to the edge of the driveway.

Mr. Zuker said that the Board has asked the Applicant about extra signage on route 1 because it can be a difficult road.

Mr. Sobel stated that they will look into the extra signage.

Ms. Walker asked the Board what they would like to do regarding the peer review.

Mr. Zuker stated he believes it is important to look at the parking count. He then thanked Mr. Sobel and stated the Board will allow for comments after Mr. Traux has spoken as well.

Rob Truax of GLM Engineering representing the Applicant stated that the Board did just receive comments yesterday from Mr. Chessia. We did additional testing Monday. We went out on the site in the afternoon and set underground testing pits. We will read them every week. We will keep in touch and Ms. Walker will come with us to view the results. We just want to put that issue to rest. It is the spring and the perfect time to set them. There is still an issue regarding the access road and putting shoulders on it to put the snow. We would like to know what the board would like us to do regarding that. The Fire Chief made a comment that the road was not necessary. We will also submit 2 thumb drives that will have all of the plans on them.

Mr. Zuker said that he knows Mr. Chessia has other issues. The Board has a report from Weston & Sampson.

Mr. Truax stated that they believe the suggestions in the report of Weston & Samson are workable.

Mr. Zuker said there is a section on the pump station designs and a section on a recommendation for the existing system that Mr. Chessia has reviewed.

Mr. Truax stated that the Applicant will address all of those issues. They have also asked for permission from the Board to speak with Weston & Sampson.

Mr. Zuker said the report is public knowledge.

Mr. DeCelle wanted to know if there were any large trees on the proposed road.

Mr. Truax said that there are a couple of trees that will come down and the developer is planning on planting some maple trees. The road is wider now. There is also a loop that gives the Fire Department easier access. If that access road does not need to be there then we could perhaps use that area for extra snow storage. It would also benefit the house at the end.

Ms. Quirk mentioned in the draft decision there is a condition that states that no trees will be planted to hinder the access.

Mr. Hiltz mentioned that there are some concerns about the pumping station not functioning as it should.

Mr. Truax stated that they are happy to revise that. We would like to contact Weston and Sampson with your permission please. At the end of the day if it does not work then it is ours. We will work that out with them.

Mr. Zuker noted that they went out in 2012 and did an inspection of the pipes. There were a number of items that they recommended that I'm sure you would want to discuss.

Mr. Costa said he would suggest that some detailed discussion happen from Weston and Sampson and our client. Any potential deficiency's we would fix. The Applicant will be paying \$690 for INI fees. Are these proposed upgrades covered by INI fees? I believe Weston and Sampson are saying there are some improvements to be made if they have any additional recommendations we would be open to that.

Mr. Zuker noted that he feels a discussion would be beneficial. He believes it is in everyone's best interest to make sure the pump station does not cause any issues.

Mr. Hiltz noted that if there are recommendation regarding INI fees that water and Sewer should discuss those.

Mr. Costa said there are system improvements that fall under the INI. We have some issues paying \$690 in INI fees and having to make additional improvements. The applicant would also like to know if you would like to have the second emergency access or not. The Fire Chief said that it is not needed. We are happy to do it but we are asking the Board to let us know what they would like us to do. We would like some guidance from the Board.

Mr. Zuker stated when they open it up to the audience to speak they will ask about the access road.

Mr. Chessia spoke about the Weston and Sampson report. He stated that he believes they would like to do some more testing on the water levels. We should get a good high due to all of this snow melting. He mentioned that he did have some questions regarding the mounding. According to their prior letter these catch basins were picking up too much in that area. I would need some clarification on that to see if these catch basins will work. Two of the oil separators will need to be divided. They have not updated the separators. That is pretty much what I am looking for. We need to wait for the ground water to come up.

Mr. Zuker said that the back system was designed to have 4 feet of ground water before. How does that affect this?

Mr. Chessia stated it depends on how much comes up. If it is 4 feet of separation and it comes up 2 feet then you still have 2 feet. That mounding analysis would have to show that the water is not getting up into it. It could be fine the way it is. We may have to expand a bit.

Mr. Zuker said we want to ensure that the ground water is not seeping into those basins.

Mr. Chessia said that is the critical point. There are wetlands up here and here. There was something presented by the abutters that this ground water is flowing into those streams. When you test in November it will be lower. We just need to obtain the current data.

Mr. Zuker asked so other than the drainage are you down to small details regarding the other issues.

Mr. Chessia said everything else is pretty minor. The original concern I had was with the way it was graded. The water could flow in here. There is a typical cross section on the detail sheet so the contractor knows to build a shoulder.

Mr. Zuker asked about snow storage especially after this winter. We do not want that snow to be blocking spaces or storing the extra snow on the wetlands.

Mr. Chessia said that there are places the applicant could put the excess snow. The could possibly store it in the recreational area. He went on to state that he does not know how you can clear every parking space with a winter like the one we just had. However this should be fine for an average winter.

Mr. Zuker asked for Mr. Chessia's thoughts on the site distance.

Mr. Chessia said to show the lines on the plan so everyone knows and don't plant in this area (pointing to the plan).

Mr. Hiltz asked if Mr. Chessia had a chance to review the letter that Laura Vaites abutter to the applicant submitted.

Mr. Chessia stated that he did try to get a hold of someone from the fish and wildlife. He had tried and tried but could never get in touch with anyone. Under DEP standards if this is a cold water fishery with trout in it then there are certain things you would need to do. You do not want to take hot run of water and infiltrate it into the stream. The entire run off from the site is directed into this basin. These basins are designed to catch it all. Relative to DEP as far as the stream water does, their design would be OK.

Ms. Walker stated that she believes most of the items have been taken care of. She was on site when they put the monitoring system in.

Mr. Zuker opened the meeting up for public comments.

Laura Vaites of 12 Johnson Drive stated since we just talked about the fishery issue. A letter was submitted on my behalf at the last meeting because I was unable to attend. The fishery people are hard to get in touch with. There are substantial trout in that stream. There is a robust fishery in that brook. We have found 19 trout from the north side. MA fisheries are declaring this as a cold water brook. They will be submitting that issue to the DEP. It is essentially as clean as drinking water. They would have to keep that clean. The catch basins are on the edge of the wetland. There is a 2 foot separation from the basin and the aquifer. This is very permeable soil.

That water is going to go right in. I have video from the summer that shows how much water there is. I spoke with Siemens and they infiltrate their water so it would not ruin the fishery. I would like this Board to hold the Applicant accountable to these same standards that Siemens has.

Mr. Zuker said if it is a cold water fishery, there are other practices you must adhere to. I believe that is under the state. I do not know the engineering side.

Mr. Hiltz said that these are DEP requirements. They are going to be subjected to no matter what.

Mr. Costa said that they have a proceeding under way from the DEP. We will make note and address it from our consultant.

Mr. Zuker mentioned that this was not a new concern. They have been aware of it for over a year.

Ms. Vaites said if it would be beneficial she could provide the video that shows the stream and the runoff.

Mr. Zuker said that it may be better suited for the DEP.

Mr. Hiltz said that whether this site has seasonably high water mark, our Engineers will be measuring it.

Mr. Zuker said that some of those questions will come up at the DEP hearing. He thanked Ms. Vaites for her hard work.

Ms. Vaites said regarding the snow storage limit. There is not a lot of area for snow storage. If there is nowhere to put the snow and it is put on the edge of the wetland, it would be imperative that they use environmentally friendly products.

Mr. Zuker wanted to know if there was anything in our decision regarding the type of products that will be used. Will they be eco-friendly?

Bill Hamilton of 45 Eldor Drive said as a tax payer, is the Applicant going to call Weston and Sampson on the Town's dime?

Mr. Zuker said no, we just discussed that. The Applicant stated they would pay for the fee.

Mr. Hamilton said that having the Applicant talk to Weston and Sampson is not as good as if they had talked with the Sewer and Water department. It is not helping us educate the Water and Sewer what is going on. They went to Sharon to find a development that was below the 2 parking spaces per unit.

Mr. Zuker said that the Sharon complex is right down the street, right by the highway. We believe that is a comparable project for them to utilize.

Mr. Hamilton said that Walpole has a few 40 B projects. We do not know Sharon's rules and regulations regarding towing. How will the Applicant enforce that? Do they have a towing company? I'm sure you can ask the Sharon Police and the police would say we do not have issues because the police cannot authorize that. That needs to be addressed to make sure we know we have the right rules and regulations.

Mr. Zuker thanked Mr. Hamilton for his comments and stated that the ZBA would invite water and sewer to their next meeting again.

Ms. Vaites said with Moose Hill Road being narrowed significantly this winter, it will be impossible for cars to get by. Is the Town going to have better snow management? Will the development help?

Mr. Zuker stated it is a public road. He understands that it has been a tough winter.

A resident said that they were unable to exit out of Route 1 a few weeks ago.

Ms. Vaites said that cars will get stuck. It will not be pretty.

Mr. Zuker said that the exact issue exists now. Every road in every town has been dealing with that. The Town has been trying to do their best. The Applicant is just responsible for their driveway. It has been a brutal winter.

Georgia Beliveau of 18 Orchard Drive said exiting out of Moose Hill out towards Walmart during 4-6:30 pm with just 42 homes that are there now is challenging. If I am going up the hill to take a right, I am stuck there. I have to wait for the second or third light to take a left. 300 cars on a neighborhood street, the only way out and in is that area. Is there any traffic information about how all of these cars are going to get out?

Mr. Zuker said that he believes that issue was covered a while ago and it was in the original traffic report.

Mr. Sobel said that yes all of that information was in the original traffic study.

Mr. Zuker said the Board would look at the study again.

Mr. Foley reiterated that we had that information at one point and that they will review it before the next meeting.

Ms. Beliveau said that she remembers that conversation at a prior meeting but she drives that road every day. She explained that she gets stuck at that light for a good 5 minutes.

Mr. Zuker said that what science says and what reality is doesn't always gel. We will get the facts and data for you.

Mr. Hamilton said he had asked this question a while ago but wanted to know if this project will be low income in 50 years.

Mr. Zuker said that as part of the 40B they are getting waivers. The Applicant would have to stay affordable. They are getting the benefit of the comprehensive permit so it would have to stay low income.

Ms. Quirk stated that there is routinely a condition placed in 40B decisions that the project can continue in the way of density just as long as the 20% of low income is maintained. We are requiring that there will be a condition that in the event they need to maintain the 20% affordability.

Mr. Hamilton said that is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Scot Curran of 261 Moose Hill Road felt the comparison of the Avalon to Moose Hill was apples and oranges. In the Avalon the overflow of parking would have to stay on the project because they are on a main road.

Mr. Truax showed the Board the site plan for the Avalon Parking lot.

Mr. Curran noted that the overflow of parking at the Avalon would have to stay on the complex because it cannot go into the road.

Mr. Zuker stated that the Applicant is willing to pay for the Town's consultant to look at it. No one wants the parking to overflow out into Moose Hill Road.

Mr. Hiltz wanted to know if we could give a copy of the Applicant's site plan regarding Avalon to the Engineer.

Mr. Zuker said that he would suggest we share that with them. It is not a Walpole project but he believes it is a good indicator.

Deb Robertson of 241 Moose Hill Road had a question regarding one of the plans and asked if she could come up and look at them.

Mr. Costa said of course, please come up and look.

Mr. Hiltz said that this is part of the reason the Board asked for electronic copies of the plans. All of the plans will be available in the ZBA office.

Ms. Vaites said that we have a project that looks like boxes. The development does not necessarily fit in with the neighborhood. They are still 4 stories high. I would recommend that they take the approach of design and make it look more like a home and not a box.

Mr. Zuker said that these buildings are lower than the road. The Avalon is higher than the road. There is a difference between this and the Sharon Avalon project. We were very careful about the height. We were adamant that it does not exceed the fourth floor. We have worked with them determining what those heights were. There is a significant setback from the road.

Ms. Vaites said that this looks like something you would see in Roxbury or Dorchester. It is urban. It is a nice style for the city. The Avalon Sharon has this nice town home type of look. It is consistent with the area. I would hope that we would have a more homey appearance for a development that is going to be surrounded by houses. It needs a little bit of different thinking for the suburbs.

Ms. Beliveau wanted to know how the school bus pick up will work.

Mr. Zuker said he would imagine it would stop at the entrance for pick up and drop off.

Ms. Quirk mentioned that the developer mentioned they would speak to the school Superintendent.

Mr. Costa said they have not had an opportunity to speak with the Superintendent just yet. He believes that there would be a pickup spot at a safe location. There should be a clear area for that. We will definitely talk with the Superintendent regarding that.

Mr. Zuker said that we had some discussion about that second emergency entrance. He wanted to know if anyone from the audience had any feeling regarding the access road.

Pam Verrochi of 266 Moose Hill Road stated that she lives right near the proposed access road. She is very happy that they do not need that road.

Mr. Zuker asked if she would be in favor of getting rid of that road completely.

Mr. Truax said that her driveway would be maintained.

Ms. Verrochi stated that yes she would be in favor of getting rid of that access road.

A neighbor from Moose Hill stated they were also in favor of getting rid of the access road as well.

Tricia Curran of 261 Moose Hill Road wanted to do if they had any plans to widen Moose Hill Road.

Mr. Zuker stated that there are no plans to widen Moose Hill. It will be repaved however. He then went on to say that hearing from the neighbors and their support in getting rid of the access road I would think the Board would be OK with asking the Applicant to get rid of the access road.

Mr. Foley, Mr Hiltz and Mr. DeCelle all stated they agree that the Applicant should get rid of the access road.

Mr. Truax mentioned that they will make that area unpassable.

Mr. Costa said there will be a discussion of 3 more conditions. One of them is related to construction, the second is the architectural plans and the 3<sup>rd</sup> is in regards to the building plans in lieu of someone being on the sight all of the time. I can provide that to your counsel. The condition states in order for any authorized activity to take place there should be a meeting with police, fire, engineering. A police detail is a standard condition. I think it addressed all of the concerns. I will submit that.

Mr. Zuker said that there was an email from the Board to the Police department. The police responded with: There may be times during construction they will need a detail but only when it impacts traffic on either Moose Hill Road or Route 1. This usually occurs when they need to make utility connections into the street or when doing construction very near the street that could impact traffic. There have been situations when due to the volume of construction vehicles entering and existing the site, the builder requests a detail but this is fairly rare. Mr. Zuker went on to say the Board will review what Mr. Costa has regarding a police detail

Ms. Curran said that when the League School did their construction they would come down Moose Hill.

Mr. Hiltz stated it is common to have a preconstruction meeting to make sure it is the safest way.

Rico Cabral of 329 Moose Hill Road said going back to parking. When there was an equation of a one bedroom with 1 car, I think more often these one bedrooms would have 2 cars.

Mr. Zuker said that was his question and feeling as well. That is why the Board is going to get a peer review. Right now they are providing 1.89; we will wait until we get that comment.

Kathy Hines of 54 Moose Hill Road said on an old plan it shows the Road being straightened and widened (November 11, 2013 plan sheet C3)

Dante Ferrara of 275 Moose Hill Road said that this map only shows what is right in front of the development.

Ms. Hines said that there are blind spots on the street right now

Mr. Zuker said that we asked the applicant to provide the site distance which is how far can you see in either direction. These are the guidelines you have to meet to make sure you have a safe stopping distance.

Mr. Hiltz said that the Board had it peer reviewed.

Mr. Zuker said there was not a plan to widen or straighten Moose Hill Road.

Ms. Beliveau asked if there was any option of widening the road. Is there room to widen the road?

Mr. Zuker said that they are looking into an acceleration/deceleration lane. It is a state road so DOT would be involved. Doing anything through DOT is hard.

Ms. Quirk said there is a condition that says the applicant should work cooperatively with the Town and requests improvements from DOT. Following improvement, signage, deceleration lane, trimming vegetation, replaces sign with larger sign.

Ms. Beliveau wanted to know if there was a timeline.

Mr. Hiltz said that it is controlled by the DOT.

Mr. Zuker said the applicant will work on that.

Ms. Beliveau, wanted to know if there are problem arises after all of this is said and done, do we contact the Town?

Ms. Quirk said that someone could contact DOT directly or got through the Board of Selectmen.

Mr. Zuker said that the Applicant will try their best. The Town does not have control over Route 1. The Applicant however has committed the money to do those improvements.

Ms. Quirk said getting back to the type of products to be used on the land at the development, that condition 25 and condition 26 in the draft decision states that fertilizer and pesticides should be minimized and road salt shall not be used on the site.

Ms. Vaites asked if this can all be organic landscaping. She felt that it not asking for too much to protect the aquatic life. She mentioned that her lawn is very green and she uses all organic.

Mr. Zuker said that we would have to ask the applicant. This is what we have in the decision as of right now.

Helena Knight of 14 Orchard drive asked how many parking spots will be designated for guests.

Mr. Zuker said at the end of the day it is an overall number we are looking at. I'm not sure how those spots break down.

Ms. Knight said that this is a big concern for the neighbors.

Mr. Zuker stated that this is why we will have that information reviewed.

Ms. Vaites mentioned all of this relates to 156 units being packed into 6 acres. The density is a concern, parking, traffic in and out of the community are all concerns. She stated she doesn't

know how they can put all of that on 6 acres and have it work. This development is not next to the T or the train line. Every resident will need to drive. There is no way to do anything else. You cannot bike or walk down Route 1. This is conservation land at that. It is still viable, let's keep that alive.

Mr. Zuker said that we could sit here and debate 40B's in Massachusetts for a long time. It is the guideline we are working with.

Ms. Vaites acknowledged what Mr. Zuker was saying and stated just do it responsibly then. Do not spoil something that can never be rebuilt.

Mr. Zuker said that they are working with the law, the Applicant, the neighbors and our consultant. It does not mean that everyone will be happy with the outcome at the end of the day. We are trying to gather as much information as we can. All of your points and statements are appreciated.

Mr. Hamilton wanted to know if the Sharon train station could be an option.

Ms. Vaites stated no way. It would be much too dangerous to try and walk/bike on that road with no sidewalks and a lot of traffic. You would have to get to that train station by car.

Mr. Zuker said at this point we are looking at April 1, 2015 meeting at the same time in the Main Meeting Room of the Town Hall. That is 3 weeks from now. We are still in discussions regarding the groundwater elevations. We hopefully will have more data to share with everyone. We will have the parking spots peer reviewed. We are going to ask the Sewer and Water commission to attend our next meeting again. We will discuss the questions that have come up with the schools in terms of buses. We will look into the organic landscaping as well.

Mr. Costa said that he will speak to his client regarding the different points the neighbors brought up. They will walk through the waiver list as well.

Mr. Traux stated that they will work on revised plans.

Ms. Quirk said that she will go over all of the conditions that have been requested. She also mentioned that as of right now we have a deadline of April 30, 2015. She wanted to know what the Applicant was thinking regarding the time line.

Mr. Costa said that they are hoping to move through this process as quickly as possible. He wanted to wait to see where they were at after the next meeting.

Mr. Zuker felt that they would have a better indicator of where they are after the April 1, 2015 meeting.

Mr. Costa said if we are going to modify the drainage structures that might take a while. If it is just getting rid of the secondary egress then that is easy.

Mr. Zuker mentioned that this process is not easy. Having the public, Applicant and consultant here is a positive way to go through the meetings. Not everyone will be happy. The last couple of meetings have been more productive than this past year. The process is working better. I think that is a positive. Thank you. All of the plans are on the thumb drives if you want to view them.

Mr. Hiltz wanted to know if we should address the possible need for an extension now.

Mr. Zuker said he felt after the April 1, 2015 meeting will be a good indicator of where we are at.

Mr. Costa stated that they are aware of the deadlines. We will continue to move forward again. If by April 1<sup>st</sup> we need a deadline then we will ask for one.

A motion was made by Mr. Zuker, seconded by Mr. DeCelle to continue the hearing to April 1, 2015 at 7:00 pm in the main meeting room of the Town Hall.

The vote was **4-0-0 in favor** (Zuker, DeCelle, Hiltz and Foley voting)

A motion was made by Mr. Zuker, seconded by Mr. Foley to adjourn the meeting at 9:39 pm

The vote was **4-0-0 in favor**. (Zuker, DeCelle, Hiltz and Foley voting)

Craig W. Hiltz  
Clerk

kb

Minutes were approved on May 13, 2015.