

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

At 7:37 p.m., Chairman Fee called the meeting to order.

**Pine Grove Definitive Subdivision – Request to Set Bond, Accept Bond and Release of Covenant**

At 7:37 p.m., Chairman Fee opened the discussion regarding the request from Peter Karassik, President of The Eligius Homes Company, to set and accept the bond regarding the Pine Grove Definitive Subdivision, and for a Release of Covenant. The Board was previously in receipt of copies of a letter dated November 8, 2011, from Mr. Karassik requesting a bond amount be set, and a letter dated November 9, 2011 from DPW Director/Town Engineer Bill Place recommending the bond be set at \$89,416.00.

Ms. Kablack reported Mr. Karassik intends to submit a cash bond, and she stated work on the site looks good.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To set the bond at \$89,500.00 to complete work for the Pine Grove Definitive Subdivision and the roadway on Huckleberry Lane.

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

VOTED: To accept the cash bond of \$89,500.00 to complete work for the Pine Grove Definitive Subdivision and the roadway on Huckleberry Lane and to release lots from covenant, subject to submission by the applicant of a cash bond in the amount of \$89,500.00.

**Cail Farm – Request for Bond Release**

At 7:40 p.m., Chairman Fee opened the discussion regarding the request from Peter Karassik, President of The Eligius Homes Company, to release the bond held for the Cail Farm subdivision. The Board was previously in receipt of copies of a letter from Mr. Karassik dated November 9, 2011, and accompanying “as-built” plans and Certificate of Compliance from the Conservation Commission, requesting a release of the bond and stating the work is completed, and a letter dated November 16, 2011 from DPW Director/Town Engineer Bill Place, recommending the bond be reduced to \$6,446.00 for the completion of the installation of shade trees, a white pine, a blue spruce and a rhododendron.

Ms. Kablack stated there are some outstanding landscaping items, and thus she recommends the bond not be fully released, but that it be reduced, as recommended by Mr. Place.

Chairman Fee asked if the reduction versus a complete release has been discussed with the applicant. Ms. Kablack stated the applicant should be aware of the outstanding items as he was copied on the letter from Mr. Place.

Since the published agenda reflects discussion of this topic following the scheduled 8:30 p.m. discussion, Chairman Fee suggested a vote be taken, subject to the applicant not appearing later tonight with further commentary.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To approve a reduction in bond for the Cail Farm Subdivision to \$6,500.00, as recommended in a letter from Town Engineer/DPW Director Bill Place, dated November 16, 2011, subject to the applicant, Peter Karassik, President of The Eligius Homes Company, not appearing later tonight with further commentary.

### **Stormwater Management Permit Review – Buddy Dog and Village Green**

Ms. Kablack reported minor site plan applications are anticipated to be submitted by Buddy Dog and the Village Green, which will also include Stormwater Management Permit applications. She recommended the Board delegate both Stormwater Management Permit reviews to the Conservation Commission.

Mr. Morely asked the status on a prior plan proposed by Buddy Dog using the Bossee Sports Club access, which Ms. Kablack reported has been abandoned. He also asked if the applications have been submitted yet. Ms. Kablack stated they have not.

Chairman Fee expressed his concern for delegating the Board's authority before an application has been submitted, and prior to knowing the scope of a project. He suggested the Board review the applications once submitted, and if needed, schedule an emergency meeting to delegate its authority, so as to not impede the decision deadline process of the Conservation Commission.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To hold on the decision to be made regarding delegating the Planning Board's authority for Stormwater Management Permit review to the Conservation Commission for the Buddy Dog and the Village Green sites.

### **Public Hearing: Special Permit Modification – Grouse Hill Incentive Senior Development**

Present: Martin E. Loiset, Jr., Permitting/Development Manager for Capital Group Properties and several Grouse Hill Development residents

At 7:49 p.m., Chairman Fee reopened the Public Hearing regarding the application by Capital Group Properties for a modification to an approved Incentive Senior Development Special Permit dated December 13 2006, property located at 32 Old Framingham Road, Assessor's Map M07, Parcel 0006, which was continued from November 9, 2011.

The Board was previously in receipt of copies of prior relevant meeting minutes from September 6, 2006, September 27, 2006, October 25, 2006, November 8, 2006, November 29, 2006, December 13, 2006, and a letter from Grouse Hill residents Barbara and John Finlay dated

November 20, 2011, noting their support for a new sidewalk on Old Framingham Road and their belief that trails through the woods would not be used by residents. In addition, copies of a letter from Grouse Hill resident Robert Diefenbacher dated November 17, 2011, stating his support for a monetary contribution by the developer for a sidewalk and the elimination of the proposed walking trails and additional visitor parking, and a letter from Grouse Hill resident Mrs. Warren was also received today.

Since its last meeting, Chairman Fee reported the Board conducted a site visit and walked both proposed walking trails. He also reported Town Counsel has since opined that, if it is decided the developer will make a monetary contribution in lieu of previously agreed to conditions, it would be possible to earmark said funds for a specific walkway, as is desired by the residents of the development.

Ms. Kablack noted the trails were required to be open to the public and were conditioned as such in the original permitting Decision. She read aloud condition #15 of this Decision, and stated the condition is likely also noted in the Condominium documents.

Mr. Hunter asked if there is a plan for the internal road to become a street. Martin E. Loiset, Jr., Permitting/Development Manager for Capital Group Properties stated the roads were always intended to be private.

Chairman Fee stated the site visit elucidated for him that the additional proposed parking spaces are not necessary, and that the proposed locations might be more aesthetically pleasing if they were to remain as is. He opined that he believes the steep descent of the walking trail leading to the drainage basin would likely not be used by the residents of the development. However, Chairman Fee further opined he does not feel similarly regarding the northern walking trail leading to Mahoney Farms. He believes this area has potential for public use, although he detected a strong septic odor in the area, which would need to be addressed if the trail were constructed.

Mr. Morely stated he believes a short connection could be useful to be constructed on the northern trail.

Mr. Sziabowski agreed with Chairman Fee regarding the proposed parking spaces and paths. However, he also is sympathetic to the need for a sidewalk in this area as requested by the residents.

Mr. Poch agreed that a walkway path on the northern end could be useful, and he noted it could be extended to other future uses such as a rail trail on the CSX property. Procedurally, he expressed his concern that the Board specifically required the trails in its Decision and he is uncertain whether the Board should now alter its position.

Chairman Fee stated he believes the Board can reassess its previous determination. Mr. Sziabowski concurred, stating the Board made its best determination in the past, and would make its best determination again at this time. Mr. Hunter agreed with Chairman Fee's conclusions from the site visit, noting it is possible to change one's mind based on visiting the site now compared to reviewing plans on paper in the past.

Mr. Morely described the intended routes of the two walkway trails and their connectivity possibilities.

Chairman Fee summarized the consensus of the Board as inclined to eliminating the proposed additional parking spaces and the south walkway trail. He further stated there appears to be unanimous support from the Board for constructing the northern trail and to accept a contribution from the developer of the balance of the cost (approximately \$12,000-\$13,000) to be dedicated to a walkway on Old Framingham Road towards Sudbury or Framingham.

Sudbury resident Jim Winschel, 30 Nobscot Road, Unit 20, questioned whether the Condominium documents prohibit on-street parking as they do for Mahoney Farms. Ms. Kablack will research this matter, although it was noted the Board did not opine on this matter in the original Decision.

Grouse Hill resident Susan Clark, 32 Old Framingham Road, Unit 32, read aloud a prepared statement, noting Grouse Hill is nearly fully occupied. She stated residents would prefer to retain the green space intended for the extra parking spaces and not pay for upkeep of spaces that are not needed. Ms. Clark stated the residents do not believe the proposed walking trails are safe, and they question who is responsible for potential liability issues. She further noted the proposed trails would be in close proximity to some units, which she believes is unnecessary, since there are other options for pedestrians in the area.

Grouse Hill resident, John Finlay, 32 Old Framingham Road, Unit 16, asked whether the northern trail would also be open to the public. Chairman Fee stated that would be the intention, based on the original decision.

Grouse Hill resident John Golden, 32 Old Framingham Road, asked the Board to consider that 88% of Grouse Hill residents have voted to eliminate the additional parking spaces and both walkway paths.

Grouse Hill resident Robert Diefenbacher, 32 Old Framingham Road, Unit 11, stated he is also a member of the Council on Aging Board. Mr. Diefenbacher walks in the area every day, and he believes the best path to this area already exists through the farm road off of Old Framingham Road.

Chairman Fee asked all parties to focus discussion on the pros and cons of a northern walking trail, since everyone seems to agree the proposed southern trail would not be accessed by Grouse Hill residents.

Maureen Dolan, 32 Old Framingham Road, Unit 18, stated even the northern trail would be too difficult and dangerous for residents to traverse. She noted hunters have been in the area and she deems both the northern and southern trails as unsafe, unnecessary and unwanted.

Grouse Hill resident Tom Travers, 32 Old Framingham Road, Unit 45, stated he and his daughter recently tried to walk the trails, and they were covered in ticks and found it very difficult to climb down and back.

Grouse Hill resident Sandra Diamond, 32 Old Framingham Road, Unit 34, stated she was not told there would be public access through the development between units 17 and 18 when she

purchased her home. She further stated the residents have voted against having this type of access through their private property.

Chairman Fee explained that the Board is deliberating a modification request to its original Decision. He further explained the Board had met several times with the developer and held public hearings to discuss what would be in the best public interests of the Town as well as the development. Chairman Fee respectfully stated it was the responsibility of potential Grouse Hill buyers to fully educate themselves on issues related to the area prior to purchase.

Ms. Diamond asked if the Board would have initially known where the public access would be and how close it would be to some units. Chairman Fee stated it did.

Mr. Poch stated the Board previously deliberated numerous considerations. He emphasized he lives nearby, and this is also his neighborhood. Mr. Poch stated new developments have brought many senior citizens to the area, but he also stated there are a lot of children in this neighborhood. He highlighted it is the Board's responsibility to consider present and future uses for the Town-owned land in this area. Mr. Poch stated the Grouse Hill development was specifically permitted with the conditions under discussion tonight.

Joe Diamond, 32 Old Framingham Road, Unit 34, urged the Board to not complicate issues and to simplify its focus onto what is the best use now for the money available. He believes this is to construct sidewalks on Old Framingham Road which will be used by the most people.

Tom Robinson, 32 Old Framingham Road, Unit 19, asked if a permanent easement has been given to the Town for these paths. If one cannot park in the area to then use the walking path, it doesn't make sense to him to construct the path.

Chairman Fee explained the Decision granting the permit to build the Grouse Hill development required a path to be constructed for public use. Thus, he further explained that, if a path is constructed, Grouse Hill residents cannot prohibit the public from walking on it. However, he also stated he suspects the Grouse Hill Condominium documents prohibit on-street public parking, which could deter use. Chairman Fee stated that, if someone were injured on the walking path, the Condominium Association would likely be responsible, but the Association would also have a claim against the Town. He emphasized both entities insure against such unfortunate circumstances.

Grouse Hill resident Roberta Parad, 32 Old Framingham Road, Unit 43, stated she walks her dog every day in this area, which is very dangerous without a sidewalk. She implored the Board to grant the request of the residents for a sidewalk.

Grouse Hill resident Betsy Levenberger, 32 Old Framingham Road, Unit 17, stated she would be directly impacted by the placement of the proposed public access to the northern trail. She emphasized the loss of privacy for her does not seem necessary when there already exists another access to the property off of Old Framingham Road.

Grouse Hill resident Eva Tsai, 32 Old Framingham Road, Unit 35, concurred with Ms. Levenberger.

Mr. Finlay agreed that the simple solution is to utilize the farm/field road as access off of Old Framingham Road.

Grouse Hill resident Marsha Gitlitz, 32 Old Framingham Road, Unit 5, also walks her dog every day in the area, and she believes a sidewalk is needed.

Chairman Fee summarized the feedback from residents as not wanting additional parking spaces, neither walking path and that they wish the developer's contribution go towards a sidewalk fund specifically for this neighborhood.

Mr. Morely stated the Board has prioritized for the Town that Old Framingham Road is a key location for new sidewalk construction. He further clarified that the rights being discussed tonight already exist within the original Decision. Thus, Mr. Morely emphasized to residents the Board is considering eliminating existing conditions and not creating new ones.

Mr. Poch stated it is important to objectively consider what the current owners in the development want with the planning objectives of the Town as a whole.

Mr. Morely reviewed the trail route which was intended for public access. He believes the northern path was envisioned to be used by the Grouse Hill residents to access a trail leading towards Sudbury Farms and he had not perceived it to be used as a public access. He suggested amending the original Decision to remove references to public use.

Mr. Lizotte noted that, if the reference for public access is removed, then use would be left up to the Condominium Association to determine.

Mr. Hunter noted the proposed monetary contribution does not cover the cost for constructing a sidewalk on Old Framingham Road. He further noted there could be other obstacles to construction, and that a contribution earmarked for the area does not guarantee construction in the near-term.

Mr. Sziabowski stated he is inclined to make his decision based on what would provide the most immediate public benefit.

Mr. Poch reiterated his procedural concern. Chairman Fee stated he does not perceive a procedural problem, since one proposed public benefit has been traded for another. Mr. Poch stated he does not perceive the two benefits as equal in value. Mr. Lizotte questioned whether any public benefit would be garnered if the sidewalk is not able to be constructed due to insurmountable obstacles. Ms. Kablack suggested any monetary contribution be earmarked for sidewalks on either Old Framingham or Nobscot Roads.

Mr. Sziabowski stated, philosophically, he has a problem supporting the construction of something the residents do not want and will not use. Mr. Hunter concurred. Mr. Morely suggested a compromise solution of constructing an abbreviated northern path, without public access. Mr. Poch stated he believes the original condition should be retained.

Chairman Fee stated he would be inclined to agree with Mr. Poch, if the Town owned and controlled 100% of the proposed walking loop. However, most of the loop is land owned by Grouse Hill.

Mr. Poch cautioned the Board to consider that, by relinquishing the ability for path connectivity now, it forever precludes future trail connections. Mr. Morely provided examples of possible connection options.

Ms. Diamond stated the Grouse Hill residents are not opposed to trails on Town-owned land.

Mr. Poch clarified there was historic use of paths on this property, and the permitting of the development allowed the historic use to continue.

Ms. Clark urged the Board to consider eliminating both paths in the interests of public safety.

Mr. Loiselle and Chairman Fee displayed the proposed southern and northern paths on a plan exhibit for clarification purposes.

Mr. Morely and Mr. Poch suggested keeping the intended walking loop within the town land and the Grouse Hill open space, and removing the portions within the Grouse Hill property. Chairman Fee agreed this is an option which should be further considered.

Grouse Hill resident Janet Wainwright, 32 Old Framingham Road, Unit 45, asked for clarification regarding how close the southern path would come to her home, which was explained to her.

Chairman Fee suggested the discussion be continued to allow the Board to ponder solutions to the issues raised tonight.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To continue the Public Hearing regarding the application by Capital Group Properties for a modification to an approved Incentive Senior Development Special Permit dated December 13 2006, property located at 32 Old Framingham Road, Assessor's Map M07, Parcel 0006 to December 14, 2011 at 8:00 p.m.

Later in the meeting, the consensus of the Board was that it is inclined to support an option which creates a trail which does not go through the Grouse Hill development and to support funds be contributed to the Town to be earmarked for a sidewalk in the neighborhood. If an easement to the Town is requested, Mr. Morely suggested a specific plan for the easement be required.

### **Grouse Hill Incentive Senior Development – Request for Bond Reduction**

This agenda item was tabled tonight. Ms. Kablack stated a surety bond is currently held for \$32,000.00, and Town staff does not recommend that it be reduced prior to repaving the site, as intended by the developer in the Spring 2012.

### **Public Hearing: Stormwater Management Permit – Lot 16 Kato Drive**

Present: Applicant Perry Beckett

At 9:07 p.m., Chairman Fee opened the Public Hearing regarding an application for a Stormwater Management Permit for Lot 16 Kato Drive, which was continued from November 9, 2011. The Board was previously in receipt of copies of a draft "Decision Stormwater Management Permit Lot 16 Kato Drive Sudbury, MA dated November 30, 2011" which denies the requested permit, since the required information had not been received from the new and current owners.

Applicant Perry Beckett gave Chairman Fee a letter tonight. Chairman Fee read the letter loud, which requested a continuation of the Public Hearing to December 14, 2011 and an extension of the deadline for action on this application to December 15, 2011.

Chairman Fee asked Mr. Beckett why the Board should entertain this request. Mr. Beckett stated the property owners need more time with their lawyer to understand the ramifications of these conditions.

Chairman Fee stated the Board is not inclined to continue the discussion because it clearly requested at the last hearing that the owners appear before the Board to submit the necessary request to reflect the change in ownership. Thus, Chairman Fee stated the Board is inclined to deny the application and to require the current property owners to file a new Stormwater Management permit application.

In response to a question from Mr. Morely, Mr. Beckett stated he hopes to finish the home construction by January 2012. Mr. Morely stated extensions have been given for the past year.

Mr. Beckett summarized a few of the concerns and questions of the current property owners. Chairman Fee sympathized with Mr. Beckett, but informed him that, unfortunately the new owners needed to be here tonight and should be addressing their concerns with Ms. Kablack and/or this Board. He emphasized that, if the property owners wish to be issued a Certificate of Occupancy, they need to file the appropriate paperwork and come before this Board.

Chairman Fee summarized the application is likely to be denied because the Petitioner sold the Premises and no consent of owner has been executed.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To close the Public Hearing regarding the application for a Stormwater Management Permit for Lot 16 Kato Drive

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

VOTED: To deny the Stormwater Management Permit application for Lot 16 Kato Drive and to issue the "Decision Stormwater Management Permit Lot 16 Kato Drive Sudbury, MA" dated November 30, 2011 without prejudice, and to advise the property owner to submit a new Stormwater Management Permit application if they desire to be issued a Certificate of Occupancy.

**Northwoods at Sudbury, Northwood Drive – Consent to Modify Stormwater Management Permit and Water Resource Special Permit**



Chairman Fee re-opened the discussion regarding the request for consent to modify the Stormwater Management Permit and Water Resource Special Permit submitted by First Colony Northwood LLC, which was continued from November 9, 2011. Ms. Kablack recused herself from the discussion, since her husband represents the Northwoods at Sudbury Condominium Trustees, and he is providing special counsel services to First Colony Northwood LLC, the successor developer under the U.S. Bankruptcy Court phasing rights auction held last year.

The Board was in previous receipt of copies of a draft letter of consent dated November 30, 2011, from Chairman Fee, on behalf of the Planning Board, for the proposed changes and layout of the site plan without the need for modifications to the original Water Resource Special Permit and Stormwater Permit, as shown on a plan entitled “Northwood at Sudbury – Modified Site Plans” dated August 1, 2011 prepared by Arthur F. Borden & Associates, Inc., and an email from DPW Director Bill Place dated November 15, 2011, acknowledging receipt of the supplemental plan and accompanying hydrograph reports and updated calculations, and stating all information is in order.

It was noted the applicant met with the Board of Selectmen, and that this discussion will be continued on December 6, 2011.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

VOTED: To consent to the Northwoods at Sudbury’s request to amend its Stormwater Management Permit and its Water Resource Special Permit for the proposed changes and layout of the site plan without the need for modifications to the original Water Resource Special permit and Stormwater Permit, as shown on a plan entitled “Northwood at Sudbury – Modified Site Plans” dated August 1, 2011 prepared by Arthur F. Borden & Associates, Inc.

**Metropolitan Area Planning Council – Route 20 Zoning District Local Technical Assistance Project**

At 9:38 p.m., Chairman Fee opened the discussion regarding the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) for District Local Technical Assistance project. The Board was previously in receipt of copies of minutes from a November 22, 2011 meeting of a Planning Board subgroup and MAPC representatives, and GIS map of the proposed Rte. 20 business corridor, a “Summary Chart of Uses in Business, Limited Business and Village Business Zones,” and a handout regarding form based codes from the Smart Growth Tool Kit.

Ms. Kablack Ms. Kablack reported the Town has been granted an extension for the project until February 2012. She then reviewed the color map with the Board and the types of questions to be answered by the Town, i.e., does it want growth, if so, where and what kind, what kind of incentives should be offered and where, etc.

Ms. Kablack emphasized Sudbury does not want to encourage sprawl. She explained the group focused on creating one central business area, covering approximately one linear mile (from Mill Village to Shaw’s). Mr. Morely suggested the area should stop before Hop Brook, Ms. Kablack stated this is the intention.

A brief discussion ensued and many topics were quickly brainstormed by the Board. Some ideas were: Mill Village area should remain as is, with Village Business zoning, as the scale and architecture are appropriate for that area; denser commercial business should be allowed in the lower Union Ave area and extending the Shaws Plaza. This can be done with an overlay zone; the upper Union Ave area as well as Chiswick Park and Raytheon should stay industrial but allow more housing-related and health care uses. These parcels are too large for intense retail uses, but could sustain other uses which support the increased commercial area of the adjacent central business district.

Ms. Kablack suggested the Board begin its next meeting early to facilitate a discussion with MAPC. She will request the MAPC provide a few good zoning examples for the Board to review in advance of the meeting. Mr. Poch suggested Ashland be researched. Ms. Kablack also noted Acton and Wayland should be referenced. Mr. Poch requested MAPC be asked to provide examples of the most successful incentives and/or policies created to achieve the intended outcomes.

### **Comprehensive Land Use Reform and Partnership Act – CLURPA – S. 1019 – Discussion**

The Board was previously in receipt of copies of the pending Senate Bill #1019 “The Comprehensive Land Use Reform and Partnership Act,” a fact sheet regarding the bill distributed by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council, and a letter signed by supporters of the bill to be sent to Speaker of the House Robert DeLeo dated October 11, 2011.

Ms. Kablack explained the bill seeks to update outdated planning and zoning laws to facilitate the permitting process.

Chairman Fee stated he is familiar with the bill, and although it has potential to be very beneficial, he does not believe it has been developed to the point where the Board could take a position on its efficacy.

Following a brief discussion, the consensus of the Board was that it supports efforts for such zoning reform, but the Board decided to not sign a letter of support at this time for the bill as drafted to date.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

VOTED: To authorize Ms. Kablack, on behalf of the Planning Board, to notify the Metropolitan Area Planning Council that Sudbury’s Planning Board decided to not sign a letter of support at this time for the Comprehensive Land Use Reform and Partnership Act (Senate Bill 1019), but that it supports zoning reform efforts.

### **Review of FY13 Community Preservation Act Project Submissions**

Ms. Kablack distributed copies of a listing of the FY13 Community Preservation Act (CPA) Proposals noting the projects, proponents, CPA category and amount requested and abridged descriptions of the projects. The Board asked for additional time to review the material and will deliberate its support of projects at a later date.

### **Minutes**

Chairman Fee noted the numbering of pages in the top right-hand corner of the minutes should be corrected. Mr. Poch requested a sentence be added to the third paragraph from the bottom of Page 6 prior to the vote, reflecting the suggestion was made to send a letter to the Board of Selectmen regarding the proposed Site Plan modifications.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

VOTED: To approve the regular meeting minutes of November 9, 2011 as revised tonight.

### **Miscellaneous**

#### **Massworks Infrastructure Grant Proposal – Outcome**

The Board was previously in receipt of a letter from the State's Executive Office of Housing and Economic Development dated November 15, 2011, informing Sudbury the Sudbury Historic Town Center Intersection Improvement Project was not selected this year for funding. Another grant round will commence in September 2012.

#### **Open Meeting Law – New Regulations Allowing Remote Participation**

The Board was previously in receipt of a *MetroWest Daily News* article dated November 18, 2011, explaining the new regulations under the Open Meeting Law allowing remote participation in public meetings in five situations: personal illness, personal disability, emergency, military service or geographic distance.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

VOTED: To authorize Ms. Kablack, on behalf of the Planning Board, to draft a letter to be sent to Sudbury's Board of Selectmen, expressing the Planning Board's support of adoption of the remote access regulations of the Open Meeting Law, while encouraging in-person participation as the preferred option with the exception of the five conditions provided by the proposed law.

### **Upcoming Meeting**

The Board's next meeting will be held at Town Hall on Wednesday, December 14, 2011 at 7:00 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned by Chairman Fee at 10:20 p.m.