

Present: Michael Fee (Chairman), Joe Sziabowski, Christopher Morely,
Michael Hunter, Eric Poch, Jody Kablack (Director of Planning and
Development), Craig Lizotte (Associate)

At 7:30 p.m., Chairman Fee called the meeting to order.

Planning Board Associate Member – Appointment

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To appoint Craig Lizotte as the Planning Board Associate Member for a two-year term to expire September 30, 2012.

The Coolidge Chapter 40 B Proposal - 189 Boston Post Road – Update

Ms. Kablack provided the Board with an update regarding a Chapter 40B comprehensive permit application proposal which has been submitted by B’Nai B’rith Housing New England, Inc. The Board was previously in receipt of copies of a memo from Director of Planning and Community Development Jody Kablack dated September 3, 2010 explaining the proposal and noting Town staff comments and recommendations; the Notice of Public Hearing on September 7, 2010 by the Board of Selectmen, and a Draft letter of support from the Board of Selectmen Chairman to the Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency dated September 13, 2010 providing comments and recommendations.

Ms. Kablack described the proposal for the Mercuri parcel located at 189 Boston Post Road (the corner of Landham Road and Route 20), which is approximately six acres. The project would construct 64 age-restricted rental units in one building within a 20,000 square-footprint. She noted that the majority of units are planned as one-bedroom and there would be a few two-bedroom units. Ms. Kablack stated that local support for the project has been expressed by the Council on Aging, the Sudbury Housing Authority and local Visiting Nurse Associations.

Ms. Kablack further noted that the Board of Selectman held a public hearing last week to concurrently evaluate the project and the Town’s Right of First Refusal opportunity under Chapter 61B. Ms. Kablack reported that the Selectmen voted unanimously not to exercise the Town’s Right of First Refusal to purchase the property and also voted unanimously to send a letter of support for the project to the Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency, noting comments and recommendations. Ms. Kablack provided the Board with copies of the revised letter dated September 13, 2010 and noted item #14 regarding the possible use of WestMetro HOME Consortium funds to help subsidize the

project. She also noted that the Selectmen asked the applicant to consider changing the mix of units to offer more two-bedroom units to better serve Sudbury's needs.

Chairman Fee asked what percentage of the units would count as affordable housing inventory. Ms. Kablack stated that because the units are rentals, 100% of the units will count on the Town's Subsidized Housing Inventory. However, she further stated that the proposal does not clearly state a confirmed percentage. The consensus of the Board was that this development would significantly enhance Sudbury's efforts to reach the mandated 10% State affordable housing quota.

Mr. Sziabowski questioned how the applicant determined the proposed mix of units and whether they would complete a market study. Ms. Kablack stated that it is believed there may not be a need for senior rental units in Sudbury, since there is no wait list at Muskethaquad Village, although that development is 25-years old. She also stated that there are 150 rental units being constructed nearby off of Edgell Road in Framingham. Ms. Kablack stated the applicant has been asked to provide documentation of need. Mr. Morely asked if there are plans to market the units to the area Jewish community. Ms. Kablack stated that the development is presented as non-sectarian.

Mr. Poch stated that the proposal seems incomplete without a market study, confirmation of the exact number of affordable units and with so many one-bedroom units.

Chairman Fee asked who would absorb future vacancies, if they were to occur. He noted that if the units remain vacant because financially there is no market for them, the applicant would still be obligated to pay property taxes and the units would still count towards the Town's affordable housing inventory. Thus, he believes there is no negative economic impact for the Town for the project to proceed. The Board concurred, however, Mr. Morely and Mr. Sziabowski noted that, from a planning perspective, the Town should try to make suggestions to help steer a project towards success, i.e., more two-bedroom units. Ms. Kablack reiterated that the proposal could include more documented data to support the plans.

Mr. Hunter asked if there has been any progress on a traffic light at the top of Landham Road. Ms. Kablack reported that there was a meeting with the Massachusetts Highway Division two weeks ago. She stated there is a preliminary design and that funds are available to proceed to the 25% design stage. However, Ms. Kablack further stated that the Town has been advised by MassHighway that the project is not considered a high priority construction project. Mr. Morely asked the anticipated cost for the traffic light, and Ms. Kablack responded approximately \$500,000. She emphasized that the applicant is a non-profit, and thus the Selectmen understand that mitigation funds would be limited. However, it is possible the Town can negotiate some walkway improvements to the area.

Public Hearing: Calvary First Baptist Church – 162 Landham Road - Stormwater Permit

Present: Sullivan, Connors & Associates engineer George Connors and Calvary Baptist Church representative Joe Rotz

At 7:45 p.m., Chairman Fee opened the Public Hearing and read the public notice regarding an application submitted by the Calvary First Baptist Church to repave the parking lot, including regrading, installation of stormwater Best Management Practices and installation of eight new parking spaces, property located at 162 Landham Road, Sudbury, Assessor's Map L10, Parcel 0018. It was noted that the Public Hearing was duly published in the *Sudbury Town Crier* on August 26 and September 2, 2010.

The Board was previously in receipt of the Application for Site Plan Approval, an Application for Stormwater Management Permit and accompanying letter, dated August 9, 2010 prepared by Sullivan, Connors & Associates; a list of abutters; and Engineering Documentation revised August 3, 2010 and accompanying plans. Copies of a memorandum including comments and recommendations from Ms. Kablack to the Board of Selectmen dated September 14, 2010 regarding site plan review for the proposal; and a letter from Sullivan Connors & Associates dated September 7, 2010, describing the redevelopment project and addressing previous Town questions. A Draft Stormwater Management Permit Decision for 162 Landham Road dated September 14, 2010 was also distributed tonight to the Board for review.

Sullivan, Connors & Associates engineer George Connors displayed an exhibit of the proposed site and explained the planned re-grading and re-surfacing of the parking lot for areas which have deteriorated, the addition of eight parking spaces and the intention to facilitate access onto Landham Road, and the stormwater components of the proposal.

Mr. Connors noted there are several vernal pools in the area on the abutting property. He reported that his firm documented the wetlands and vernal pools on the abutting subdivision, and therefore has knowledge of those constraints since they are within 100 feet of the present proposal. Mr. Connors stated that bioswales would be constructed in the rear section and he noted that the parking lot is not heavily used. He also explained that the installation of rain gardens would be used to achieve some treatment of stormwater. In addition, Mr. Connors stated a berm would also be installed along the edge of the pavement with appropriate grading to direct runoff into the swale and rain garden. Plans also provide for the elimination of invasive species. Mr. Connors noted that the impervious pavement would be increased slightly to 52,500 square feet from 51,000. He also stated that the plans have been prepared to meet the TSS removal rate goals.

Ms. Kablack noted the applicant's timeframe to complete the project before winter is fast approaching. She explained that the project has received an Order of Conditions form the Conservaiton Commission, and will also require a Site Plan review by the Selectmen,

scheduled for next week. Concurrent review was possible, but the engineer did not realize it until the Notice of Intent was filed, and the timing of that permit did not allow for the concurrent review. Mr. Morely asked why a site plan is required. Ms. Kablack stated that any change in parking accommodations of non-residential uses necessitates a site plan review. However, she further clarified that addition of 10 or fewer parking spaces is considered as a minor site plan review. Ms. Kablack stated that the proposal would provide improvements to the site. She also noted that she and Mr. Lizotte have discussed the stormwater plans provided. Ms. Kablack emphasized that, in the future, waiver requests must all be submitted in writing.

Mr. Lizotte stated he has reviewed the stormwater permit application and plans and has viewed the site. He has concluded that the proposal is a stormwater management improvement to the site. Mr. Lizotte stated that, due to the vernal pools, he had initial concerns regarding how the infiltration would be handled. However, he further noted that he is comfortable with the Conservation Commission's review of the inherent issues. Mr. Lizotte also stated that because the project is a redevelopment there is more leeway with the DEP guidelines.

Mr. Lizotte opined that the site presents challenges and he questions whether the TSS removal rates presented can be achieved. However, he also noted that the Stormwater Pollution Plan and O&M Plan would provide longer-term benefits to the site. Ms. Kablack confirmed these plans have been submitted to the Town in the Notice of Intent.

Mr. Lizotte noted that Sudbury's Stormwater Bylaw requires managing peak rates and matching volumes, whereas the Massachusetts' guidelines only require managing peak rates. He opined that this project would likely not match volumes and questioned whether few projects could. Ms. Kablack stated she is awaiting comments from Lisa Eggleston regarding this feedback and it is possible the bylaw may need to be amended in the future to remove the volume requirement. In response to a question from Chairman Fee, Ms. Kablack also stated Ms. Eggleston had reviewed the Conservation Commission's Order of Conditions.

Mr. Connors explained that the area vernal pools were extensively studied over a three-year period by the Conservation Commission when his firm worked on the neighboring Brookside Farm Lane site. All parties agreed at that time, that the proposed plan was the best given the existing conditions and circumstances of the site.

Mr. Morely opined that, currently the runoff sheets off across the property line and that this proposal would be better than the existing conditions. Mr. Connors confirmed this to be true. Mr. Morely asked if the proposed mitigation is sufficient for the additional eight parking spaces proposed. Mr. Lizotte stated that the amount of pavement being added to the site for the new parking spaces is not significant, and he reiterated that the O&M plan would have longer-term benefits.

Chairman Fee stated that the proposal should be viewed in perspective as a small project. He noted that the bylaw is more intended for larger parcels and projects which have potential for greater impacts. Chairman Fee further stated that the plan protects the water resources, the Conservation Commission has reviewed it and he is inclined to grant the permit. He also commended the applicant, with its limited resources as a religious institution, for pursuing the project with all applicable Town entities so that the project is completed properly. Joe Rotz, representing the Calvary First Baptist Church appreciated the recognition, stating that the Church did not initially realize how much work was involved, but has been willing to comply with regulations to improve the site once the environmental issues were presented.

The Board reviewed the Draft Decision. Ms. Kablack highlighted Condition "C" on Page 3, and noted that item #1) is unnecessary, since it is at ground level. She asked if specific plantings should be noted for the bioretention areas. Mr. Lizotte stated that the plans are adequate as presented for the size of the project. Thus, Ms. Kablack noted that items #1) and #2) should be deleted from Condition "C." Mr. Morely noted that Condition "E" item #4 on Page 3 should also be revised, since a certificate of occupancy would not be required.

Chairman Fee recommended, and the Board concurred, that the Draft Decision be revised and circulated to the Board, applicant and Mr. Connors for review to be voted upon following the Board of Selectmen Site Plan review on September 21, 2010.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To close the Public Hearing regarding a Stormwater Management Permit application submitted by the Calvary First Baptist Church to repave the parking lot, including regrading, installation of stormwater Best Management Practices and installation of eight new parking spaces, property located at 162 Landham Road, Sudbury, Assessor's Map L10, Parcel 0018.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was also unanimously:

VOTED: To approve the Stormwater Permit application submitted by the Calvary First Baptist Church, to repave the parking lot, including regrading, installation of stormwater Best Management Practices and installation of eight new parking spaces, property located at 162 Landham Road, Sudbury, Assessor's Map L10, Parcel 0018, and to instruct Ms. Kablack, on behalf of the Board, to revise and finalize the Draft Decision for 162 Landham Road to be circulated to the Board, applicant and applicant's engineer for review and comments, to then be voted on by the Board at a specially scheduled meeting following the Site Plan Review by the Board of Selectmen.

Later in the meeting, it was decided to tentatively hold September 22, 2010 at 8:00 a.m. for a meeting to vote on the Permit Decision. Mr. Morely, Mr. Sziabowski and Mr. Hunter confirmed attendance.

Bond Reduction – Cail Farm

The Board was previously in receipt of a letter from Peter Karassik, President of The Eligius Homes Company, dated July 12, 2010, requesting a reduction in bond for the Cail Farm Subdivision Road and utility work and a letter from Town Engineer/DPW Director Bill Place, dated July 1, 2010, recommending that the bond be reduced to \$19,800.39. Ms. Kablack stated the Town currently holds a \$34,300 bond, and she recommended reduction of the bond for completion of the remaining work.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To approve the request of Peter Karassik, President of The Eligius Homes Company, dated July 12, 2010, for a reduction in bond for the Cail Farm Subdivision Road and utility work to \$19,800.00 as recommended by Town Engineer/DPW Director Bill Place, in a letter dated July 1, 2010.

Open Meeting Law – Remote Participation

The Board was previously in receipt of copies of the Commonwealth's Office of the Attorney General notification regarding the "Division of Open Government Request for Comments on Remote Participation in Public Meetings Issued August 31, 2010."

Ms. Kablack reviewed the questions provided by the State for consideration. She stated that she could formulate a response from the Board if it wishes her to do so to be submitted by the due date of October 1, 2010.

Chairman Fee opined that he views this as a significant change. For hearings that occur over several meetings, he questioned the validity of the discussion if those members physically present as part of the quorum are not the same members at the next meeting. Mr. Morely noted that not all the same members need to vote at each public meeting and that concern would only apply to public hearings, where the first quorum must also be in place for future hearings.

Chairman Fee opined that he does not view this recommendation positively. He believes there is something to be gained from all parties being in the same room, reviewing documents and exhibits together and observing body language of meeting participants. Chairman Fee further opined that, as anachronistic as the public meeting system may seem, it actually works having the people who are making the decisions in the same room. He believes the remote aspect will also make meetings harder to administrate.

Mr. Hunter opined that it is increasingly more difficult to get people to volunteer for boards and committees because they are so busy. He believes remote access might increase participation. Mr. Poch concurred, stating it affords more people the opportunity to participate. He believes it is better to have remote participation from a member than no participation at all due to scheduling conflicts.

Mr. Sziabowski disagreed, stating he has been involved in many remote participation situations for business and he does not believe the meeting quality is quite the same, or the focus quite as strong, as when all parties are in the same room together. He believes remote access could be disruptive and distracting to the proceedings.

Mr. Hunter stated that a physical quorum would already be required and exist, and therefore it should not really adversely influence the meeting outcome.

Chairman Fee stated that, although he could see some merit for increased participation opportunities, it did not outweigh his belief that remote participation would detract from the decision-making quality of the meeting.

Mr. Poch emphatically disagreed, stating that multi-national companies successfully conduct business in this manner every day around the world. He believes it is an extremely attainable situation to have all participants (including remote) prepared with materials in advance for meeting discussions.

Mr. Morely stated that participation by more people is better, and he does not see many negative aspects to the recommendation. However, he strongly feels that a quorum must be present and he is concerned that this change could set a “slippery slope” for possibly eliminating the requirement of a quorum in the future.

Mr. Hunter noted that the Planning Board’s work is very visual, reviewing site plans, exhibits, etc., and he would strongly suggest that the technology used be video-oriented.

Chairman Fee reiterated that he believes the quality of information processed is reliant on being at the meeting and reviewing sometimes new material which is distributed. He does not believe a remote participant should vote on matters if they are not in attendance. A few Board members thought the revised law would only allow for voting by the quorum. However, Mr. Poch believes the revisions would allow all to vote on issues, even remotely.

Mr. Morely asked who initiated this proposal. Mr. Poch responded that it has been discussed for several years and that he broached it a few years ago with the Board. He opined that the State Office for Disabilities may also be a supporter of the initiative.

Mr. Morely stated that he believes the Board should share its feedback with the State, even though it has varying opinions about the topic.

Mr. Poch reiterated that he believes allowing remote participation is a positive change and that restrictions to participation should be limited. He further stated that he is uncertain if a physical quorum is needed, since he believes meetings and their members are typically homogenous in nature.

Chairman Fee disagreed, noting that there is a difference between municipal and corporate meetings. In a corporate environment, participants are being paid to achieve a common goal with a shared philosophy. In a municipal setting, decisions are being made which costs taxpayers money and not everyone is in agreement with the mission. He also noted that there is a risk for appeal and/or exploitation of the decisions made, and thus it is critically important to be present to weigh the evidence and vote.

Mr. Poch disagreed, stating that those with the proper motivation and resolve to be involved in the process will contribute in a high-quality manner. He supports remote participation and views it as an inclusionary revision to the law. Mr. Hunter concurred. Mr. Morely stated he could support the recommendation only if a quorum is still required to be present and if a quorum is not eliminated in the future.

Chairman Fee stated that, given the quasi-judicial nature of municipal activities, there are too many variables for him to entertain allowing someone who is not physically present in the room to vote.

On behalf of the Board, Ms. Kablack will formulate a summary of tonight's discussion to be sent to the State's Assistant Attorney General Britte McBride, prior to October 1, 2010.

Minutes

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

VOTED: To approve the regular meeting minutes of July 13, 2010.

Miscellaneous

Pine Grove Development - Update

Ms. Kablack stated that Peter Karassik has decided to pursue a five-lot subdivision plan for this property. He is scheduled to ask the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) at its September 20, 2010 meeting (Ms. Kablack will attend) to consider waiving its rights to deny a related application within a 12-month period if he moves forwards with a subdivision plan.

Mr. Morely suggested that the Board express to the ZBA that it supports the request for a waiver. It was further suggested that Ms. Kablack provide the ZBA copies of the

Planning Board July 13, 2010 Meeting Minutes which recommended Mr. Karassik pursue this course. Mr. Morely opined that the waiver request is a result of the applicant's discussions with this Board, and it is a step in the direction it believed to be preferable.

Chairman Fee suggested that Ms. Kablack express at the September 20th meeting that the Planning Board is inclined to entertain and grant a waiver to allow a single-family subdivision on the lot and it encouraged Mr. Karassik's request for a waiver. However, Chairman Fee noted that Mr. Karassik has not yet filed an application with the ZBA, and thus has no legitimate standing to seek such relief, which would likely also not be enforceable. He further noted that Mr. Karassik is asking for an advisory opinion of the ZBA similar to what he asked of the Planning Board. Chairman Fee emphasized that it is important that the ZBA does not perceive that the Planning Board has promised anything to the applicant.

Ms. Kablack stated that she believes the ZBA has a good understanding of the parcel and is aware of the public input and feedback from previous meetings, which it will consider as part of its deliberation process.

Upcoming Planning Board Meeting Schedule

The Board's remaining meetings for 2010 are scheduled as follows: October 13, 2010, November 10, 2010 and December 8, 2010. If additional meeting times are required, the Board will be notified.

Commonwealth Capital Application for FY11

Ms. Kablack had previously distributed copies to the Board, for informational purposes, of Sudbury's completed Commonwealth Capital Application for FY11 and an explanatory memo from her dated August 17, 2010. She also stated that a lengthy application has also been submitted for wastewater funding from DEP.

Comprehensive Land Use Reform and Partnership Act – Senate Bill 2482.

Ms. Kablack had previously distributed copies to the Board, for informational purposes, of a letter from the Town of Stow Planning Board dated August 11, 2010 to State representative Kate Hogan and State Senator James Eldridge regarding its concerns related to the Comprehensive Land Use Reform and Partnership Act – Senate Bill 2482. Chairman Fee stated this is the best revision of Chapter 40A he has seen presented in years, and he hopes it passes. He opined the current law is extremely inadequate and needs to be reworked.

Memo from Attorney General on Bylaw Votes:

Ms. Kablack had previously distributed copies to the Board, for informational purposes, of a letter from the Commonwealth's Office of the Attorney General dated August 19, 2010 regarding the approvals of the Annual 2010 Town Meeting Warrant Articles.

FY11 Board of Selectmen Goals

Ms. Kablack had previously distributed copies to the Board, for informational purposes, of the FY11 Board of Selectmen Goals Adopted August 24, 2010.

Mr. Poch questioned why the goal for a wastewater facility on Route 20 to assist the business district is not more prominently on the list under the headings of economic benefit or public health when it is clearly the Town's top priority.

Ms. Kablack noted that the project is noted regarding the creation of the Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC) and the validation of the Curtis Middle School Field as a viable disposal site. She also clarified that the list of goals is not presented in priority order.

Mr. Poch believes this project should be the number one goal and highest priority for the Town. He further suggested that establishment of a viable wastewater facility to provide relief for the business district should be listed as a long-term goal.

Ms. Kablack noted that the list includes achievable goals and seems to be more specific than general.

Mr. Morely and Chairman Fee agreed that establishment of a wastewater facility should be listed as a long-term goal, particularly if remediation of Hop Brook is so listed. Mr. Poch concurred, and he opined that this is a higher priority and should be listed ahead of other goals such as a regional dispatch center. Mr. Poch believes the current public sentiment would be more receptive and supportive of projects such as establishing a wastewater facility, which has the potential to lower the residential tax rate, than it would to projects such as constructing a large police station. Mr. Poch further believes the Selectmen should have listed a more comprehensive goal about achieving a wastewater facility in the business district.

Ms. Kablack stated that one of the goals of the CAC will be to assess public opinion from residents and the area businesses. It was noted that businesses have not been uniformly in favor and supportive of the project in the past. She welcomed Board members interest in working with the CAC as it develops.

Mr. Morely asked how the facility would be paid for. Mr. Poch stated this project is a huge economic undertaking for the Town and may be the highest priced project on the horizon, which is why it should be delineated with a comprehensive goal. Ms. Kablack estimated the cost of the project at approximately \$15 million.

Mr. Morely, Mr. Sziabowski and Chairman Fee agreed that this project should be listed as one of the highest Town priorities.

Chairman Fee asked Ms. Kablack, on behalf of the Board, to draft a memorandum to the Board of Selectmen, stating the Planning Board reviewed that Board's FY11 Goals, and, although it was pleased to note two references regarding the creation of the Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC) and the validation of the Curtis Middle School Field as a disposal site, it was the unanimous consensus of the Planning Board that the Town's number one priority should be the siting and construction of a wastewater treatment facility for the Route 20 business district, and that a more comprehensive goal is necessary and appropriate.

Mr. Morely suggested, and the Board concurred, that it may be necessary to hire someone to concentrate their work on achieving this goal. Thus, Ms. Kablack was also asked to state in the memorandum to the Selectman that the Planning Board would suggest that a project of this magnitude deserves dedicated staff time to accomplish the goal.

Annual 2011 Town Meeting – Potential Warrant Articles

Ms. Kablack asked the Board to begin to consider articles it may want to pursue for the Annual 2011 Town meeting.

Chairman Fee stated that he believes the accessory dwelling bylaw needs further public clarification and that the Board should schedule a joint meeting with the ZBA, or a few members of the ZBA, to discuss issues which have arisen this year to better determine if the bylaw needs revisions. Ms. Kablack stated that she will broach this with the ZBA at its September 20, 2010 meeting, since this bylaw and proposed guidelines are planned for discussion.

Chairman Fee also suggested that the board consider putting forth a ban on outside wood burners. He noted that there are now several in Town which should be addressed. Ms. Kablack stated that the Board of Health had not wanted to act on this previously, since it believes there is no definitive evidence that these structures are harmful. She believes a prohibition of the units would be well received. Mr. Hunter noted that the structures are not regulated in any manner. The consensus of the Board was that Ms. Kablack should begin to research a draft general bylaw.

Ms. Kablack suggested that the Board might want to consider presenting an inclusionary local affordable housing zoning bylaw, if Chapter 40B is repealed at the polls. Chairman

Fee opined that, if Chapter 40B is repealed, it would be a good opportunity to invite those opponents to help Sudbury design something better specific to this Town through a public process. He further opined that it might generate a referendum of whether affordable housing is important to Sudbury. Ms. Kablack suggested that something new be prepared for the 2011 Town Meeting. Mr. Morely questioned if the timing is right for a Town Meeting presentation.

Ms. Kablack noted that she is unsure if requests for wastewater funding will move forward this year. She also is not sure if the final design and construction funds of the Town Center will go forward this year, although funds are available for a 25% design plan.

Ms. Kablack noted that she has received many proposal suggestions for Community Preservation Act funding consideration which will be shared at a future meeting. She also stated that a potential land preservation deal may also become public soon.

Sudbury Housing Trust – 3 Marlboro Road Development – Update

Chairman Fee reported that the Sudbury Housing Trust (SHT) met several times with appropriate parties and the neighborhood regarding the proposed development at 3 Marlboro Road. As a result of those discussions the SHT has decided to pursue a three unit design. The SHT will next meet regarding the project on September 17, 2010 and the ZBA will next discuss the project at its September 27, 2010 meeting.

Application For Endorsement of Plan Not Required – Ford Road and Chanticleer Road - Clearwater Pond LLC

Ms. Kablack briefly reviewed with the Board the Form A Application For Endorsement of Plan Believed Not To Require Subdivision Approval for Ford Road and Chanticleer Road, submitted by Clearwater Pond LLC. She noted that she has reviewed all the easements, which are adequate and properly labeled. Ms. Kablack recommended approval.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

VOTED: To approve the Form A Application Endorsement of Plan Believed Not To Require Subdivision Approval plan submitted by Clearwater Pond LLC, plan dated September 10, 2010.

Application For Endorsement of Plan Not Required – 96 Lincoln Lane

Ms. Kablack briefly reviewed with the Board the Form A Application For Endorsement of Plan Believed Not To Require Subdivision Approval submitted by Brian Jadul for

96 Lincoln Lane, Sudbury. Ms. Kablack stated the intention is to combine two lots into one, and she recommended approval.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

VOTED: To approve the Form A Application Endorsement of Plan Believed Not To Require Subdivision Approval plan submitted by Brian Jadul for 96 Lincoln Lane, Sudbury.

The meeting was adjourned by Chairman Fee at 9:30 p.m.