

Present: William Keller, Jr. (Chairman), Lisa Eggleston, Christopher Morely,  
Michael Hunter, Michael Fee, Eric Poch; Associate {left 9:05 p.m.},  
Jody Kablack (Planner)

The meeting was called to order at 7:45 p.m.

***Lawhorn Definitive Subdivision*** (Dakin Road) – ***Public Hearing***

Representing the applicant: Attorney Myron Fox, Bruce Ey (Engineer).

The public hearing notice was read into record by Chairman Bill Keller. Documents in the file were listed.

For record, Attorney Myron Fox disclosed that he represents the father of the Planning Board's Associate Member, Eric Poch, in a separate matter.

Bill Keller ascertained disclosure was sufficient and it presented no issue for the Board.

Myron Fox reviewed the proposal for the creation of a right-of-way within an easement which will create frontage for an additional lot off Dakin and Field Roads. This is a unique situation – the Lawhorn's legal frontage is on Field Road. Currently there is a 50' right-of-way out to Dakin Road that the applicants utilize. Three families; the Hermanns (owners), the Meeks and the McIvers, have used the driveway for the past 18-19 years without any issues. There is a driveway easement on record and lots 1, 2 and 3 have shared expenses. The Town Planner had asked for written consent from the three families for the proposal. This was submitted to the file. The McIvers want to purchase a building lot from the Lawhorns (Lot D) with frontage on Field Road. The Lawhorns were going to sell but realized they would lose frontage. They wanted to create a cul-de-sac for frontage which would have made the Hermann's house illegal, therefore a 50' private right of way was created. On the ground, the difference will not be noticed. The existing 12' driveway with the same owners accessing it will be maintained. No additional houses will access it. Lot D will access Field Road. The proposal will allow the creation of a small vacant lot off Field Road (less than 2 acres) and a 3.65 lot off the private right-of-way off of Dakin Road. This right of way within the easement will be owned by the three families whose written consent was submitted tonight.

Myron Fox reviewed the memo prepared by the Town Planner dated January 31, 2003. The applicant is still requesting the waivers listed. The Planner's memo requested the location of the existing 50' wide easement be shown on the plan (p. 2, item 2). Myron Fox asked that this be waived as the proposal does not impact the number of cars. They

were asked to show Paddock Way on the plan which they did. The applicant will work with the Town Engineer regarding the street name. They have submitted the soil data as requested. The Planner asked for the wetlands to be flagged (item 3). The applicant confirmed it is not within the Conservation Commission's jurisdiction. The next item on the Planner's memo regards sight distance requirements which the applicant requests be waived as the 3 houses currently accessing Dakin will be the same 3 under the proposal; no additional cars are being added. The applicant also requests the requirement for 600' of newly created walkway be waived. With regard to the Planner's recommendation to record a deed restriction, Attorney Fox would prefer the information not be put in the form of a deed restriction but rather as a condition in the decision. Bill Keller pointed out the Planner's concern was to not open a door for an ANR.

The memo also stated the Director of Public Works required the driveway be widened to 18 feet to accommodate emergency vehicles. Both the applicant and the Town Planner confirmed with the Fire Chief the driveway as it is was sufficient.

Mike Fee: Regarding flagging the wetlands, you stated you are not touching the border but are you expanding the way to the North?

Myron Fox: No, on paper only.

Chris Morely: Currently, the Hermanns own the way and it's within an easement; what of the right-of-way in the future?

Myron Fox: All involved parties will sign papers stating the new right-of-way is to be owned by 3 parties. It will be stated publicly and privately that it will not be constructed. In addition, it will be noted on both the plan and in the decision that further subdivision requires approval.

Bruce Ey: The pond area overflows in a northerly direction. They could build a road according to town specifications without filling in the pond. They would be required to go to Conservation, but nothing in the wetland act would prohibit it. There is no grade issue; the area is relatively flat. They have more than a 50' strip of land to create the way. They are not crossing the pond with the actual driveway. The sight distance is also adequate.

Lisa Eggleston: Are there concerns with access from Field Road to the new lot?

Bruce Ey: There are no wetland issues and the frontage on Field Road is good.

Mike Hunter: At the far end of Field Road, the McIvers have frontage. Why isn't that being used?

Bruce Ey: Had to prove to the Lawhorns that Lot D was buildable. The applicants did not want to disrupt the area with more street and this proposal seemed to be the best solution.

Bill Keller: The Lawhorns will remain in the same house. Are there any issues of auto accidents further down by the field?

Bruce Ey: No.

The hearing was opened to the public. There were no questions or comments.

The Board discussed the waivers requested.

Jody Kablack: Title certification is never waived; when recording the covenant you must have the true owners listed. Will not need a covenant in this case so that can be waived.

Bill Keller asked the applicant to provide reasons why the Board should waive this requirement for title certification.

Myron Fox: Should people who believe they own it do not, it will be an issue for the owners and not for the Board. There are three households that will be continuing what they have been doing for years; the way will not be used by any other households. It will not be a precedent.

Bill Keller: You will need to provide copies of the deeds.

Myron Fox: Will provide deeds for the lots and a cover memo stating they are true and accurate. He will run down the deeds from the date of deed to the present.

Bill Keller: Also confirm the owners have not conveyed out.

The Town Planner reviewed the waivers requested with the thought the applicant was trying to keep the plan to one page. With regard to waiving wetland certification by the Conservation Commission, Mike Fee opined it was a philosophical issue to require full compliance – the applicant is saying they are not really building.

Lisa Eggleston: If the Board waives the road construction/right-of-way requirements it must be certain to be revisited to avoid future problems.

Jody Kablack: The Board has dealt with constructing a road without approval in the past (Berry property, Peter's Way).

Lisa Eggleston: Sight distance changes as vegetation grows – flagging wetlands, they could change. This should all be revisited if a road is built at some future date.

Jody Kablack: The two ponds are shown so future owners are on record that there are constraints.

Lisa Eggleston: Nothing is being built, but should a time come when that changes could it be an issue.

Mike Fee: There should be specifications on the reasoning.

Bruce Ey: The pond is man-made, it is unique. They are not disturbing the wetlands.

Mike Fee: What was stated in the prior decision that created these lots?

Jody Kablack: There were no conditions on it.

The Board will continue to work on the wording in relation to further building.

Jody Kablack: Regarding item 2, page 2 on her January 31 memo the plan should be changed to say "easement" instead of "right-of-way". A paper street does get named on the official map – the applicant will work with the Fire Chief. The Hermanns have to be added as record owners.

The Board scheduled a site visit for Friday, February 7<sup>th</sup> at 8:30 a.m.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To continue the public hearing for the Lawhorn Definitive Subdivision to 3/5/03 at Town Hall, 7:30 p.m.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To instruct the Town Planner to prepare a draft decision for the Lawhorn Definitive Subdivision.

The chairman informed members of the public present this would be their only notice of the continuation.

### ***Willis Hill II – Public Hearing Continuation***

Bill Keller called the hearing to order at 8:40 p.m. Since the last meeting held on the Willis Hill II proposal, only one additional correspondence from the Town Engineer was submitted to the file.

Jody Kablack: One question which was raised at the January 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting was whether we could require the road be constructed in less than two years. After checking the Subdivision Control law, the Board is within their rights to require this. The Planner suggested it be one year.

Bill Sinton: 46 Cudworth Road

Are there remedies in case of an order like this?

Bill Keller: Yes, the Board may vote to take the bond (which has been done in the past).

Bill Sinton: A bond for this would be more comprehensive; is it sufficient in that the Town is covered?

Bill Keller: Yes. The bond includes 100% of the construction, plus contingencies and inflation.

Jody Kablack: The water line is there already with the pipe 4-5' under the existing grade. With this proposal it will be 10' under which is an issue with the Water District. The Planner suggests a condition be put in the approval that the water line and other utilities should conform to typical cross section for maintenance purposes.

Susan Richman: 183 Willis Road

Per Jody Kablack's memo, if the pipe has to be raised, will their access be disrupted?

Chris Morely: It will not bring the grade up in front of your house.

Bill Keller: If they build up the grade, the pipe has to be the same depth.

Jody Kablack: It is also done in stages so you will always be able to access your house.

Susan Richman: Had a question on the roadway as it crosses in front of her property.

Jody Kablack: Kendra will be approximately 2-4' higher than its present location.

Lisa Eggleston: Believes its 10' not 4'.

Susan Richman: There will be a fair slope between her driveway and Willis Road?

Lisa Eggleston: Your driveways are in a right-of-way of the road he constructs, so the developer will grade the driveway to the road.

Susan Richman: Am I guaranteed it will be a passable driveway when it's done?

Jody Kablack: Yes, the grading plan meets requirements. The Board will make a special condition that driveways off Kendra which are disturbed will be properly graded and bermed.

Lisa Eggleston: Suggested working with the applicant to make the slope more gradual. Also need to condition all driveways for drainage.

Susan Richman: The rest of the houses will be higher with drainage being handled by basin so she will not get flooded?

Jody Kablack: Yes. The Board may want to review a site plan for that house (Lot WR8). Need more detailed plan to be sure the abutters won't be disturbed.

Lisa Eggleston: Should also require a site plan for Lot WR13.

Susan Richman: Prior to digging and paving, will the property lines be marked?

Jody Kablack: We will require that on both lots as well as the flagging of wetlands.

Susan Richman had a question on the drainage direction.

Lisa Eggleston: It will be outside of your property.

Susan Richman: Has the Conservation Commission approved this?

Jody Kablack: Yes, they have approved the subdivision road and drainage.

Susan Richman: What about maintenance?

Jody Kablack: The developer is responsible until the road is accepted as a public way, but the Town will plow once it is paved.

Bill Sinton: Is the developer responsible for each driveway on Kendra Lane?

Bill Keller: There are transition standards from the roadway to driveways; if you want more gradual transition you should work with the developer.

Bill Sinton: Will he be required to put them in conforming to the regulations?

Jody Kablack: Yes, the driveway relocations must be in conformance at the developer's expense.

Lisa Eggleston: We will not sign off on the plan until he meets the requirements. Be sure the grading easement agreement should meet your needs.

Sharon Chiang: 193 Willis Road

What about a walkway – is it currently proposed for Willis Road from Briant to Kendra?

Jody Kablack: We are working with Mr. Quirk to construct this segment. Mrs. Chiang spoke with the Town Planner. She is in favor of the walkway but made some valid points about the stone wall; 2 lots don't have a stone wall and the last property has a full stone wall which may cause a problem for purposes of getting the walkway in. Will need to follow-up with Bill Place.

Chris Morely: Pointed out the benefit of the abutters discussing this as well.

Bill Keller: The Planning Board would like to see more walkways in general and use every opportunity created by a developer to obtain.

Sharon Chiang: There is also the issue of children waiting for buses – safety.

Susan Richman: What about cutting of vegetation?

Jody Kablack: Coming out of Kendra onto Willis Road there are sight distance concerns which vegetation cutting may not suffice.

Sharon Chiang: Would that require removing trees?

Jody Kablack: Doesn't believe it is a tree issue – may be a street issue. Can only take down trees in a public right-of-way which would be a developer's concern. The issue still needs review.

Bill Sinton: When the hearing is closed, does it start a time frame for the developer?

Bill Keller: Yes.

Bill Sinton: Can he delay the decision? Bill Keller: No.

Sharon Chiang: Does the road have to be in before he builds houses?

Jody Kablack: He must either put the road in or bond it.

Chris Morely: It is not uncommon to do both simultaneously.

Lisa Eggleston: Only for road and infrastructure, not houses.

Bill Sinton: Are you party to the easements?

Jody Kablack: We require them; however, it is your responsibility to make sure you are protected.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To close the public hearing on Willis Hill II.

***Sudbury Housing Authority*** – Discussion on Town Meeting Articles

Jo-Ann Howe, Steve Swanger and John Darcey were present for the Housing Authority.

John Darcey (Chairman) spoke on the Housing Authority's proposals for affordable housing. Mr. Darcey has both Land Use Priorities Committee and Community Preservation Committee exposure. In Sudbury there are approximately 5,700 dwellings of which 250 are affordable, which is only 4%. The state requirement for affordable housing is 10%. The Community Preservation Act which was passed last year provided an opportunity for funding for affordable housing. The CPA tax gathers money and sets it aside for various purposes such as open space, housing and historic preservation. The Housing Authority is proposing seven homes on scattered sites throughout town. Although this is a new proposal, it is an old idea. The Housing Authority already has some housing which goes virtually unnoticed; the only public attached housing is Musketahquid Village. Under this proposal, there is \$3.1 million in proposed costs. They are hoping to use town owned property to construct housing units which the School Committee, Conservation Commission, Park & Recreation, Selectmen and the Housing Authority own. The Selectmen have, in concept, approved the Housing Authority plan and with Town Meeting approval will use CPC funds. In addition, the Housing Authority intends to access state aid, up to \$1.2 million, which is not impacted by current state cuts.

That will cover half of the cost with the remaining balance being debt service which would be paid from rental income.

Steve Swanger spoke next. The process for the Community Preservation Committee, which was formed by the Selectmen, was a very quick process. The Committee had three months to review several proposals by various Boards. The affordable housing requirement mandate was a priority. There is a need for rental housing in town as well as other types of affordable housing. A committee is currently being formed by the Selectmen for this purpose.

The CPC process was accelerated because of the funding schedule. There is a public hearing scheduled for Monday, February 10<sup>th</sup>, with the Board of Selectmen. There was a meeting held by the housing authority in the fall on the subject but it was poorly attended.

John Darcey informed the Board and public present the Housing Authority had sent a letter to abutters of the proposed sites for the upcoming Selectmen's meeting which was just confirmed by the Selectmen on Friday. Again, the issue of affordable housing is not a new subject; it has been a topic of the Master Plan and Land Use Priorities Committee. Frost Farm is a good example where land was used for demands on the town (elderly housing, open space demands). The Housing Authority owns six duplex homes plus a handful of single family units. There is a waiting list of 45 currently. There is a greater demand for affordable housing than senior housing. Also with family units, there is little turnover and typically, they are occupied by "empty nesters" who have no smaller units to relocate to. The 16 units under this proposal was not a magic number. It was picked in case modifications to the proposal are made. Although the 16 units will not bring the town near the State required 10%, it does show an effort to the State.

Steve Swanger: There is an economy of scale to the 16 unit proposal; however, they wanted to keep it reasonable. When the Housing Authority built houses in 1990, they were under scrutiny. They were approved at Town Meeting and the Housing Authority has managed them for 10+ years. The houses have won design awards and potentially will be used as prototypes for the State. The location of the existing Sudbury Housing Authority duplexes are: 4 houses on Fairbank Circle, 1 house on Pine St., and 1 house on Old Meadow Road.

The idea is to make them blend in with the architecture as well as socially. 19 out of 21 family households in the Housing Authority have at least 1 person working which helps the economic goals via labor pool. 40% of the occupants work in town, which is another benefit for the town. The Housing Authority is looking for input from Boards and residents. The sites now have become more public; they are dealing with competing interests. Anyone with vacant property near them would like to keep it that way. Steve Swanger is also someone who does not like to cut down trees – however, integrating development in communities means irritating neighbors. The Housing Authority has tried to scatter the houses. The priority is being addressed for the Town to meet the State mandate and to protect against Chapter 40B versus the concerns of individual abutters.

John Darcey: The Housing Authority is making every attempt to be sensitive to neighbors. They have 6 houses/21 units of affordable housing with no complaints from neighbors.

Steve Swanger: Their experience has been that the values of the houses adjacent to the Sudbury Housing Authority houses have increased property values at a higher rate than other houses in town.

Bill Keller: The Planning Board has no direct role in the decision, but will provide comments. On the list of locations, what are the number of units?

John Darcey: Each house will have two or three units with each unit having 1-3 bedrooms. They do have some need for one bedroom units.

Bill Keller: As a member of the Planning Board, he does prefer development through a normal process rather than Chapter 40B – this gives the Town more say and input. He cited Longfellow Glen and the Marrone properties; this proposal is an alternative to that. The following comments were made by Board members:

Mike Fee: Feels the Housing Authority has been accurate in their assessment of the Master Plan regarding components of affordable housing and its goal to support it. He commended the efforts of the Housing Authority. As an attorney specializing in real estate litigation, he is aware that there is a big legislative push to revise Chapter 40B. The law is evolving slowly. The State does look more favorably when a town shows an effort or an active plan. This proposal fits with the status of the law as its developing. With that in mind, duplex arrangements make sense. He personally believes more units on one site would present more problems for integrating them or getting along with neighbors. However, high density in an area not near a transportation road could mean trouble for more town support and with that in mind, duplexes do not seem to fit in strategically.

John Darcey: From the north side of town to get to Route 20 is very difficult as it is a major thoroughfare. For this reason, people often shop elsewhere. Longfellow Road is proposed with the highest number of units because of acreage and setback. Park and Recreation acquired when “pocket parks” were being considered.

Steve Swanger: When Park and Recreation met again regarding Longfellow Road, they didn't think it was appropriate for park and recreation purposes. The Housing Authority homes are 1 building per acre and are built to look like single family homes, generally having one car.

Mike Fee: Understands it is a balancing test. Should 16 units be approved at Town Meeting, how does it help?

John Darcey: It would bring the Town up to about 5%; gaining one percent.

Mike Fee: Suggested a mission statement; development of a document with the Housing Authority's goals. The State looks at that when deciding appeals on Chapter 40B projects.

Steve Swanger: Opportunistically, they would do it when funding is there – they have tried proposals at Town Meeting in the past.

Mike Fee: It is easier to implement aspects of the Master Plan – something similar may help the Housing Authority.

Steve Swanger: There is a new committee being formed as previously mentioned. They will work with the Housing Authority input. There is more of a sense of partnership in Town now with other committees than in the past. The Housing Authority can only do one piece.

Lisa Eggleston: Is the \$320,000 in the proposal from the 10% CPA funding?

Chris Morely: The plan is to bond the \$320,000, with each annual payment coming from the 10% housing funds.

John Darcey: It is unlikely this group will go through the CPC again.

Lisa Eggleston: The waiting list of 45, are they Sudbury residents?

Jo-Ann Howe: Most of the people live or work in Sudbury or are relatives of Sudbury residents. They get preference.

Lisa Eggleston: What about the impact on the schools? What is the average profile of occupants?

John Darcey: In the family units the average is 1.6 school age children/household.

Chris Morely: A 40B development would add more school age children per household.

Lisa Eggleston: Same acreage with a subdivision development would have the same impact. What about the teardown stock? Is there any opportunity these houses could be made available?

Jody Kablack: That is one of the issues the new committee on housing will tackle.

John Darcey: Teardowns now cost \$450,000.

Lisa Eggleston: Versus the town buying the land.

John Darcey: Spend \$450k for 2 family versus a single family.

Lisa Eggleston: Would like to see existing houses being utilized. What procedures and rules would apply – zoning/density development?

Jody Kablack: Would be comprehensive permits under the Zoning Board of Appeals; one permit for different sites.

Lisa Eggleston: Should it be 5 bedrooms per house in a Zone II; density/septic locations.

Jody Kablack: Not looking at anything yet. Longfellow Road is a Zone II (Maynard well). They are trying to keep it at 5 bedrooms/acre. They are exempt from the Water Resource Special Permit but the Planning Board does make suggestions. They are not exempt from Title V/State mandate.

Chris Morely: What about the issue of listing more properties on the proposal than needed?

John Darcey: Anticipates them all on the Warrant, with the exception of one, which will allow for them to individually transfer ownership to the Selectmen then to the Housing Authority. They listed more properties because they could run into issues such as:

1. Not having definite ownership
2. Anything could happen at Town Meeting
3. If all are approved, they could still run into engineering or conservation issues.

Chris Morely: The plan is for 16 units, no more; what will happen with the extra sites if approved?

John Darcey: If within two years of Town Meeting passage and the Housing Authority hasn't built, the ownership goes back to the Town/Selectmen.

Chris Morely: On your list of preferred order, if you work with Conservation, would it change that list?

John Darcey: The goal is to integrate homes and families in the best way – they would take the opinion of the Engineering Dept.

Steve Swanger: The Housing Authority would always prefer to build one house on a site if possible.

The discussion was open to public comment:

Robert Rogers: 84 Longfellow Road

Reviewed the history of Longfellow – it was granted for the purpose of a playground. In 1987 the land was said to be permanently held as Conservation land. Park and Recreation transferred the land off Longfellow Glen.

Mike Fee: If there is a restriction on it that would have an impact on the proposal. Is the Conservation Commission in favor of this?

John Darcey: Yes.

Brian Swords: 76 Longfellow Road

Understands it is a difficult job for the Housing Authority. On Longfellow Road the 8 units/4 houses wouldn't connect to the road. It wouldn't integrate like other developments. The 6.73 acres includes a pond with approximately 4 acres to be transferred for building purposes. This doubles density in an area where the only open space is publicly owned. People are always utilizing this area; recreation use is not satisfied anywhere else. Park & Recreation voted to release it was never intended to be used for park and recreation purposes. He is concerned this is a rush to judgment; the timeframes have been very quick. He is very affected by this proposal and only found out about it a week ago. Most abutters have not even heard yet. Regarding the values on abutting properties, he feels duplexes would be detrimental to open space. For transportation; there is access to route 117 but if the goal is for the labor pool into town, it does not provide any benefit. He feels 8 units/4 acres is very high. 4 homes on 4 acres, what happens if it's not used? Mr. Swords also pointed out two times prior the Town has reserved the land for recreational use, the original intent. He feels he should not have to work so diligently to protect this.

Robert Rogers: The entrance into the area is 53.74'; people will cut into residencies.

John Floyd: 68 Longfellow Road

He has lived there 20+ years. He does not feel the land is suitable for this proposal. It is used constantly from late spring to late fall by children. There is wildlife in the woods where they are proposing to build. It is the last open area owned by the Town on the north side; seems this is a last opportunity to preserve the original intent.

(John Floyd)

It is used but not in the sense of a Park and Recreation field. He feels the Housing Authority's priorities are not wrong, but not balanced. He is concerned the state budget is unreliable to rely on for money. A higher density situation may be more cost effective.

Miles Halsbond: 38 Willow Road

He is an abutter to Hemlock. Regarding Mr. Swords definition of his property on Longfellow, Hemlock is similar in that it was also deeded as a playground as the original intent. There is also a wildlife issue. This proposal for 9 houses with a current 12' easement between houses means if built, cars will be going through a very narrow access. This is very disturbing. He has no objection to affordable housing and recognizes the efforts and difficulties of the Housing Authority. As Mr. Fee mentioned, the State is looking for progress. What happens if we meet these needs, then what? We could lose control to developers. Is there a better way? Would larger units be better than destroying conservation sites? Public awareness is another issue in his mind. The initial meeting was not largely attended because no-one was aware of it. This meeting today was held without a notice. Legally not obligated to have public notice, but morally he doesn't feel this is fair. Regarding comprehensive permits, if that is the case, don't zoning regulations have to be observed? (Mike Fee: That is correct.) Mr. Halsbond is concerned this proposal provides little legal status, can object but it won't be adhered to. Feels this is being rushed and they are sacrificing individual property rights. "Not in my back yard" is how most people feel about development. There should be affordable housing but there must be other options.

Kristine Thurston: 38 Willow Road (Miles Halsbond's wife)

She was struck by the Longfellow Road residents' comments as she also is committed to open space not just affordable housing. Once open space is destroyed, it is gone forever – no going back. This is detrimental to the wildlife and children in the area. They were told nothing would be built there. The land was given with the intent for open space and recreation. She is a strong proponent of affordable housing. She would not have an issue if it were going into the lot beside her (existing lot, frontage). There is a narrow lot between her house and her neighbor; a wildlife path to the wetlands which would cause a great disturbance for plants and animals. Also wanted to comment the people who know and love this area have just found out about the proposal.

Bill Keller: There is time between now and Town Meeting. Monday night is the Selectmen's meeting and they will most likely continue. This is a standard timeframe for town issues.

Miles Halsbond: Wanted to know the Planning Board's reaction on long term planning/affordable housing. He understands Mr. Fee's point regarding state mandate.

Bill Keller: Board members would like to see more affordable housing; a goal of both the Planning Board and Master Plan. The fact that each site is proposed separately is a plus as it needs to be assessed case by case. The Planning Board is in support of affordable housing. The Master Plan also supports and encourages diversified housing.

Chris Morely: The sense of the town is for scattered sites not big developments.

John Darcey: Wanted to let the public know it has not been the Housing Authority's intent to hide things. The Selectmen's meeting will most likely continue beyond Monday

night. Until sites adjacent to particular homes came in the proposal, there was not an interest. The Housing Authority meets the first Monday of each month at Musketahquid. They have always been open meetings and input has always been welcome. It would have been impossible to list all potential (400+) sites just due to the process.

Steve Swanger: Both he and Jo-Ann Howe have been working at this for over 10 years; 12-14 years ago there were more potential sites. The longer the Town waits to act, the less sites there will be. In addition, ten years ago there was more money available; the longer we wait, the less money will be available. The sooner they act, the more control the Town will have.

The Housing Authority thanked the Board for their time.

***Omnipoint Water Resource Special Permit*** (Town Gravel Pit) – ***VOTE DECISION***

The Town Planner briefed the Board on the application status. No changes have occurred with the exception of the Water District resolution to sign off on the plan, then countering and saying they may not get consent. The Planner reviewed minor items needed and plan amendments.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To approve the Omnipoint Water Resource Special Permit as amended.

***2003 Town Meeting***

The Sign Bylaw revision went out with a public hearing notice.

The Water Resource Special Permit revision; Conservation wants it only allowed if it is an existing site and not a new or vacant site. The Conservation Commission has invited the Planning Board to their meeting on February 10<sup>th</sup> to discuss.

***Miscellaneous:***

The Selectmen will be requesting a Planning Board representative for the Community Housing Committee.

The Board signed a confirmatory block for an old ANR plan of Land submitted by Joe Maillet which was never recorded with the Registry of Deeds after it was originally endorsed.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 p.m.