

Present: Michael Fee (Chairman), Christopher Morely, Michael Hunter, Joseph Sziabowski, Pat Brown, Craig Lizotte (Associate), and Jody Kablack (Director of Planning and Development)

At 7:32 p.m., Vice-Chairman Hunter called the meeting to order.

Public Hearing: Stormwater Management Permit – 804 Boston Post Road

Present: Project Engineer Tom DiPersio, Jr. and Peer Reviewer for the Town of Sudbury Planning Board Lisa Eggleston

At 7:32 p.m., Vice-Chairman Hunter opened the Public Hearing and read aloud the Public Notice regarding the application submitted by Executive Realty Associates, applicant, and Harry Coxall, owner, to construct one (1) new single family dwelling at 804 Boston Post Road (Assessor's Map K04, Lot 0015), which will involve the disturbance of approximately 17,480 sq. ft. of land area, and which is part of a common plan for development which will disturb in excess of 40,000 sq. ft. The Board was previously in receipt of copies of the Application for Stormwater Management Permit received November 27, 2012 and accompanying plan, a letter from Eggleston Environmental dated January 7, 2013, and a letter of response to Eggleston Environmental from project engineer Tom DiPersio, Jr. dated January 16, 2013. Chairman Fee recused himself from this application as he represents the owner of the property.

Project Engineer Tom DiPersio, Jr. displayed plan exhibits, describing Lots 2 and 3 on the north side of the property. He noted highlighted borders of wetland areas. Mr. DiPersio stated the plan has kept the disturbance outside of the 100-foot buffer, and a common driveway has been incorporated to minimize runoff impact. He also stated the general flow of stormwater would be from west to east towards the wetlands. A grass swale is planned along the driveway, which will deliver water to an infiltration basin, and he indicated its proposed location along the east side of the common driveway. Mr. DiPersio also stated roof drain dry wells are proposed for the two homes. He emphasized that neither the rate nor volume of flow is anticipated to change.

Mr. DiPersio stated an operations and maintenance plan was provided, and revised plans were submitted last week which addressed many of Ms. Eggleston's concerns. He stated test pits were performed regarding the septic system, and it is believed the site has sandy soils, with the exception of the knoll area. Mr. DiPersio stated confirmatory test pits under the infiltration areas could be performed as a condition of approval. He briefly reviewed the stormwater design.

Sudbury Planning Board peer reviewer Lisa Eggleston stated she received the revised plans yesterday and will need more time to review them. Ms. Eggleston stated Mr. DiPersio has addressed in his January 16, 2013 letter most, but not all, of her concerns. She explained the primary reason this project is subject to a permit is the amount of area of disturbance during construction. Thus, Ms. Eggleston stated particular concern should be given to the sediment control plan, subsequent maintenance issues and options to help protect neighbors located down grade. Regarding maintenance, she questioned which homeowner would be responsible for the infiltration basin or whether a homeowner's association would be established.

Ms. Eggleston stated another concern is regarding the soils on site. She stated she has not seen all the logs. However, Ms. Eggleston emphasized it is critically important to determine the soils are appropriate under the driveway infiltration basin. She recommended the Board require confirmatory test pits be completed sooner rather than later to help the Board determine if the project is feasible.

Mr. Lizotte asked what kind of soils were the basis for the recharge basin calculations. Ms. Eggleston responded, noting her concern that the soils are indeed of an A quality rather than C.

Mr. Lizotte stated Sudbury's bylaw states the stormwater design must comply with Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) regulations. He noted DEP requires a minimum of three test pits in the basin area, and the plan does not include any. Mr. Lizotte recommended the test pits be completed as soon as possible, prior to construction. Mr. Morely questioned if current weather conditions are adequate for completion of test pits. Ms. Eggleston, Mr. Lizotte and Vice-Chairman Hunter stated the work could be completed now.

A brief discussion ensued regarding clear-cutting by owners, now or in the future, around the swale. Mr. Lizotte noted this is not regulated by Sudbury's Stormwater Management Bylaw.

Sudbury resident Ian Feldberg, 24 Peakham Road, stated he is an abutter to Lot 3. He asked for clarification regarding the area of disturbance and where the buffer zones would be in regard to his property. Mr. Feldberg also asked how the buffer zone is recorded to ensure adherence.

Vice-Chairman Hunter explained this is a stormwater management permit application and not one for a subdivision approval. Thus, these are considered ANR lots with little authority to require conditions on screening and buffers. Ms. Kablack further explained there are no zoning requirements for buffers. She further stated the permit will require the project is built according to the plan.

Using the plan exhibits, Mr. Feldberg indicated where his home is located, and he asked where the area of disturbance for the roof drainage will be located. Mr. DiPersio responded, and Ms. Kablack read aloud the thresholds.

Ms. Kablack asked if another alternative could be considered instead of roof drains which would require less clearing of vegetation. Ms. Eggleston stated drip trenches are possible, and Mr. DiPersio agreed this is an option.

Ms. Eggleston suggested the Board consider a condition to the Permit with language to reflect that the Permit is being issued for only the disturbance presented in the plan, and any further disturbance would require further review.

Sudbury resident Mike Rogers, 22 Peakham Road, lives next door to Mr. Feldberg. Mr. Rogers stated he is concerned the water collected by the roof drain will be disbursed onto his property. He asked if the roof drains could be re-located to the other side of the house. Mr. DiPersio stated the drains could not be moved to the other side because the septic system is there. He further stated no problems are anticipated for Mr. Rogers' property. Ms. Eggleston noted water is draining adequately at present in this location, and no changes are being made which should alter the situation.

Mr. Lizotte asked if the plan could be reconsidered to locate the septic system in the back, and to put the roof drains in the front, to be responsive to downgradient neighbors' concerns. Mr. DiPersio stated he is not sure an abutter would rather have a septic system closer to their property. Additional discussion about drip trenches followed.

Mr. Lizotte asked if Ms. Eggleston is comfortable with the design of the stormwater management system for the roofs. Ms. Eggleston stated it is probably adequate, but she is less confident about the infiltration basin in the driveway soils. She stated she needs more time to review the revised materials submitted.

Mr. Lizotte urged the applicant to complete at least one test pit hole in the proposed basin area prior to the Board's next meeting so data can be evaluated.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was voted 4-0 (Mr. Fee recused):

VOTED: To continue the Public Hearing regarding the application submitted by Executive Realty Associates, applicant, and Harry Coxall, owner, to construct one (1) new single family dwelling at 804 Boston Post Road (Assessor's Map K04, Lot 0015), which will involve the disturbance of approximately 17,480 sq. ft. of land area, and which is part of a common plan for development which will disturb in excess of 40,000 sq. ft. to February 27, 2013 at 7:30 p.m.

Public Hearing Continuation: Senior Residential Community – Pickwick Development Corp. – Special Permit – 40 Tall Pine Drive – The Green Company

Present: The Green Company representatives Alan Green, Dan Green and David Caligaris, Attorney Joshua Fox, Project Engineer Bruce Ey, and residents of the Tall Pine Drive Neighborhood

At 8:20 p.m., Chairman Fee opened the Public Hearing regarding the application of Pickwick Development Corporation for approval of a Definitive Special Permit for a Senior Residential Community (SRC) located at 40 Tall Pine Drive, Assessors Map J06, Parcel 0023, showing 26 residential units for sale to persons 55 years or over on approximately 18.8 acres which was continued from December 12, 2012, and he opened the Public Hearing for a Stormwater Management Permit for the same development. He announced, for the record, that he had recused himself from the previous Public Hearing tonight because he represents the applicant on another matter.

The Board was previously in receipt of copies of the Application for Stormwater Management Permit for Pickwick Development Corporation, applicant, and Codjer Pines, LLC, owner, to construct twenty six (26) housing units and associated infrastructure on a 18.84 acre parcel of land located at 40 Tall Pine Drive (Assessor's Map J06, Lot 0023), which will involve the disturbance of approximately 311,224 sq. ft. of land area, including slopes in excess of 20%, and accompanying materials, and a letter from Bruce Ey, P.E. dated December 17, 2012, and accompanying plan of the sewage disposal systems and wells within 200 feet of locus.

The applicant's attorney Joshua Fox stated project engineer Bruce Ey will present stormwater information tonight.

Chairman Fee stated the Board would like to first hear updates on outstanding issues from the last meeting regarding the Special Permit before beginning the stormwater discussion. He referred to the minutes of the last meeting, and he asked for an update on the intermittent stream, the development buffer, the radius at Tall Pine Drive and Horse Pond Road issues.

Mr. Ey stated an informal meeting was held with the Conservation Commission on this application which was positive and another meeting has been set. He stated the applicant explained their position regarding the intermittent stream, and he believes they will be able to reach agreement with the Commission. Mr. Ey also stated a Notice of Intent has not been submitted yet because the applicant wanted to first pursue feedback from Ms. Eggleston.

Mr. Ey further stated they are in the process of revising the plan to re-work their initial buffer request. Mr. Ey stated the access road on the east side of the units has been eliminated, and he referenced on the

exhibits the cross sections he is working on. Chairman Fee summarized that a waiver may be needed, but one that is not as big as originally anticipated.

Mr. Ey described some ideas for future screening. Mr. Hunter asked if the applicant could consider a similar approach for the 100-foot buffer area. Mr. Ey stated the area is tight, and it may be difficult to do along the entire 100-foot line, while also retaining the space for the total number of homes preferred by the developer.

Mr. Caligaris stated the applicant is working on settling the conservation-related issues, and that they clearly understand their importance.

Mr. Ey stated he had not discussed the Tall Pine Drive/Horse Pond Road radius with DPW Director Bill Place, but he reviewed the area himself. He believes increasing the radius would be difficult on the southwest side because it would require moving a major utility pole. However, Mr. Ey stated he believes the northern radius could be widened. He will submit a plan to Mr. Place next week.

Mr. Ey stated Ms. Kablack helped to coordinate a meeting for him last week with Ms. Eggleston and Conservation Coordinator Debbie Dineen regarding drainage, which was very helpful.

Mr. Sziabowski stated he had requested receiving design plans electronically at the last meeting, and he repeated the request tonight. Mr. Caligaris apologized for not forwarding them earlier, and he stated he would do so. He also distributed copies of a color rendering to the Board for review.

Mr. Ey stated he hopes to submit a revised drainage report to Lisa by Friday of this week. Although the Conservation Commission had noted a concern regarding too much work being planned in the riverfront, Mr. Ey explained the work is allowable. Based on recommendations from Ms. Eggleston, he stated he has been able to eliminate a basin and raise the bottom of the remaining basins by two feet. Mr. Ey also stated the access road has been extended to the large basin.

Ms. Kablack asked if the applicant is still planning to ask for a 100-year storm amount waiver. Mr. Ey stated they are not.

Mr. Lizotte stated test pit data has not yet been collected from the infiltration systems' areas. He noted the DEP regulations require a minimum of three test holes in these areas. Mr. Lizotte stated the plan is well-defined, but he urged the applicant to collect this data now in accordance with the regulations.

Ms. Eggleston stated she met with Mr. Ey for initial comments on technical stormwater-related issues. She believes there are good soils on the site. Ms. Eggleston stated her biggest issue is determining the groundwater elevations. She suggested the applicant look at ways to get more recharge closer to Tall Pine Drive, and she mentioned connections to subdrains might be helpful.

Ms. Eggleston noted there is some drainage off of Tall Pine Drive which does not meet the State regulations. She believes this project is a good opportunity to improve this situation, but she is aware that there is some ambiguity regarding ownership of the Drive.

In response to a question from Chairman Fee regarding additional information needed, Ms. Eggleston stated a lot more is needed, including the revised stormwater design and new calculations. She will provide a letter, noting a "to-do list, including the recommendation that soil testing be completed before permit approval is granted.

Chairman Fee then opened the discussion up to the public.

A Sudbury resident (name and address unclear) asked how close the nearest part of the development would be to Dudley Brook, and whether Mr. Ey is familiar with how swampy this area is and the drainage issues which he believes already exist. Mr. Ey estimated the development would be approximately 170 feet away from the brook, and he said he is familiar with the area, and he has walked it several times.

Sudbury resident Jerome Paluch, 96 Bridle Path, asked for clarification regarding how close the septic system location would be to his home across the street. Mr. Ey stated the septic system would not impact Mr. Paluch's property, and that the system would be set back approximately 60 feet from the street. Mr. Paluch also stated concern regarding the drainage work which will occur near the access to his home. Mr. Ey stated the planned upgrades should improve current conditions significantly, and that he has discussed proposed work with the DPW and the Conservation Commission.

Sudbury resident Rich Testa, 69 Ames Road, asked if any regrading is proposed for the back, where all the water is being directed. Mr. Ey stated fill will be brought in for the homes in the back.

Mr. Paluch stated the radius at Tall Pine Drive and Horse Pond Road is a safety concern. Mr. Ey stated the location of the utility pole presents a situation out of the applicant's control. Chairman Fee stated it may not be possible for the applicant to improve this situation.

Sudbury resident Gene Golob, 4 Bridle Path, asked if the drainage pipe would transverse Tall Pine Drive. Mr. Ey explained the proposal for the drain pipe, which should provide a significant improvement from current conditions.

Sudbury resident Nancy McHugh, 96 Bridle Path, asked for clarification regarding who the applicant is, and about ownership, which Mr. Fox explained.

In response to a question from Mr. Testa, it was stated the intention is to improve Tall Pall Drive in its current location, but not to extend it towards the Cavicchio property.

Chairman Fee suggested the Public hearing be continued, and he asked what the applicant would do prior to the Board's next meeting. Mr. Fox stated there is a meeting scheduled with the Conservation Commission for the second week of February, Mr. Ey will continue to work with Ms. Eggleston on stormwater issues, Ms. Eggleston will produce a letter of "to-dos," and Mr. Ey will revise the plan and drainage report and submit it to Ms. Eggleston in the next several days.

Mr. Lizotte recommended the applicant collect more data and perform the required test pits during the next week, prior to revising the plan.

Chairman Fee noted the Board supports the applicant moving through this process at its own pace, but it is helpful for the Board to know what to expect for the next meeting. He summarized that the stormwater information should nearly be complete for the next meeting on February 27, 2013, and another meeting would likely be needed to further deliberate the Special Permit application. Mr. Ey and Mr. Caligaris confirmed this is the goal, and that they will try to address as many of the outstanding issues as possible at the February meeting. Chairman Fee also advised the applicant that the composition of the Board will change in May 2013.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To continue the Public Hearing regarding the application of Pickwick Development Corporation for approval of a Special Permit for a Senior Residential Community (SRC) located at 40 Tall Pine Drive, Assessors Map J06, Parcel 0023, showing approximately 26 residential units for sale to persons 55 years or over on approximately 18.8 acres, and to continue the Public Hearing regarding the Stormwater Management Permit application for the same development to February 27, 2013 at 7:45 p.m.

Maple Meadows – Request for Lease Approval

Present – Developer Robert Roth

At 9:22 p.m., Chairman Fee opened a discussion with Maple Meadows developer Robert Roth regarding a request for lease approval for some of the units in the development. The Board was previously in receipt of an email from Mr. Roth dated January 10, 2013.

Mr. Roth thanked the Board for its time tonight to consider allowing the future owner of unit 1103 to lease their home to a qualified person over 55 years of age for a one to two-year period. He explained the future owner has signed a Purchase and Sale Agreement, but has been unable to sell their current home. Leasing the future home would release some financial pressure for the homeowner. Mr. Roth stated he believes the Board has the authority to approve this according to the approved Special Permit. He also believes other developments have allowed the leasing of units at Grouse Hill and Mahoney Farms.

Mr. Roth highlighted he believes prospective homeowners for his Senior Residential Community (SRC) should be allowed to do this because they are buying full-market units and paying full property taxes to the Town.

Chairman Fee stated the homeowners do not currently have the ability to do this.

Mr. Roth stated he believes the only requirement is that the occupant be 55 years of age or older. He emphasized the housing market is still struggling, credit is tight, and not being able to lease their unit could deter senior citizens from purchasing a new home. Mr. Roth reiterated the homeowner has signed a P & S, the Association Trustees have voted to allow the unit to be leased, and he asked for the Board's approval to do so.

Mr. Morely asked who voted in the Association. Mr. Roth stated he did and two other individuals.

Mr. Hunter stated the Grouse Hill and Mahoney Farms examples were different because approval was given to the developers and not the homeowners to lease.

Ms. Kablack opined that the homeowner is actually the one who should be requesting permission to lease from the Board.

Chairman Fee stated he agrees with all of the points made by Mr. Roth. However, he is uncomfortable with the Board being asked to exercise its discretion in the absence of any supporting documentation. At a minimum, Chairman Fee recommended, and the Board concurred, the Board should be able to review a copy of the lease, a redacted copy of the Purchase and Sale Agreement, proof that the renter is 55 years of age or older and a copy of the Association vote. Ms. Kablack recommended age verification of the homeowner also be provided.

Mr. Sziabowski stated he would support the request, pending review of this documentation. He also stated he is pleased the lease has a duration limit.

It was noted the approval would be only for this one unit.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To approve the request to lease the Maple Meadows Condominium Unit 1103, subject to receipt of the following documentation: a copy of the lease, a redacted copy of the Purchase and Sale Agreement, age verification of both the homeowner and the renter as being 55 years of age or older and a copy of the Association vote.

Mr. Roth asked procedurally whether the lot line between the two lots could be eliminated. The consensus of the Board was they would likely be considered ANR lots.

Public Hearing – Revisions to the Stormwater Management Bylaw Regulations

At 9:40 p.m., Chairman Fee opened the Public Hearing regarding revisions to the Stormwater Management Bylaw Regulations, originally adopted on September 9, 2009 as follows: 1) Section 6.J.2 to remove the word “repaving: and to change the number “2,000” to “5,000”; 2) Section 6.J.3 to add the word “sewer” after the word “water”; and 3) Section 7.D.2 a by adding the following sentence at the end of that section: “The initial amount of this technical review fee shall be two thousand dollars (\$2,000.00).”; and any other changes identified in this Hearing. The Board was previously in receipt of copies of the Public Hearing Notice and the Sudbury Wetlands Administration Bylaw Regulations Revised September 12, 2011.

Ms. Kablack stated the Hearing Notice was reissued to remove the Conservation Commission as requested by the Board on November 28, 2012. She explained the Commission only references the Planning Board’s regulations in the Wetland Bylaw regulations. Thus, the Commission will not have to adjust their regulations to comply with the proposed revisions.

Chairman Fee noted the Public Hearing Notice referenced former Commission Chair John Sklenak’s name in error, and he noted there is no one present tonight to provide public comment.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To waive the reading of the Public Hearing notice.

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

VOTED: To approve the revisions to the Stormwater Management Bylaw Regulations, originally adopted on September 9, 2009 as follows: 1) Section 6.J.2 to remove the word “repaving: and to change the number “2,000” to “5,000”; 2) Section 6.J.3 to add the word “sewer” after the word “water”; and 3) Section 7.D.2 a by adding the following sentence at the end of that section: “The initial amount of this technical review fee shall be two thousand dollars (\$2,000.00),” as set forth in the Public Hearing Notice published January 3, and January 10, 2013.

Route 20 Zoning - Update

Chairman Fee asked for an update regarding the Route 20 Sewer project survey. Ms. Kablack stated she is working on the survey, and she hopes to send it out in the next two weeks. She believes it is important to solicit feedback from the businesses as well as the property owners. Chairman Fee asked that the suggested revisions be incorporated into the final survey, and he urged timely completion of this project.

Site Plan Application – Scott McIver, Trustee of the Macot Realty Trust – 65 and 71 Union Avenue

Ms. Kablack stated the Board of Selectman held and closed a Public Hearing last night regarding an application request of Scott McIver, Trustee of the Macot Realty Trust, owner, for modification of an approved Site Plan for a change of use of approximately 14,000 sq. ft. for Methods Machines, located at 65 and 71 Union Avenue, zoned Industrial District and Industrial Park District, Town Assessor Map K08, Parcel 0051 and 0087. The Board was previously in receipt of copies of a letter from the applicant's attorney Joshua Fox dated December 20, 2012 and the accompanying Request for Modification application, plans and exhibits, the minutes of the Design Review Board January 9, 2013 meeting, a memorandum from Conservation Coordinator Debbie Dineen dated December 31, 2012, noting questions and a memorandum from Director of Planning and Community Development Jody Kablack dated January 16, 2013, noting comments and recommendations, and meeting minutes from a Town staff Pre-Application Meeting on January 8, 2013. Ms. Kablack stated the application progressed well and the business is expanding. Since the Selectmen closed their hearing last night, the Planning Board determined there is no need to provide commentary.

2013 Annual Town Meeting – Potential Articles - Discussion

Site Plan Authority

Ms. Kablack stated Ms. Brown, Mr. Morely and Chairman Fee attended last night's Selectmen's meeting to discuss potential Warrant articles for the 2013 Annual Town Meeting. The consensus of those that attended was that there is no interest from the Selectmen regarding shifting the review authority for Site Plan from the Selectmen to the Planning Board. However, it was noted that discussion of important Town Meeting articles by the Planning Board, Facilities Director, Town Manager and Finance Director that evening seemed to be cut off due to the scheduling of 2 minor site plan reviews on the Selectmen's agenda. Chairman Fee suggested that this situation again be communicated to the Selectmen, and the Site Plan Review Authority article be submitted.

Mr. Morely stated he suggested a compromise with the Selectmen where members from both entities could be involved in the Site Plan process, but the Planning Board would have the final word. He believes this is an important issue for a Planning Board, and he supports proceeding with an article for Town Meeting. Mr. Sziabowski stated why not allow Town Meeting to have the discussion. Ms. Kablack cautioned bringing an article before Town Meeting which could fail, and thereby taint the credibility of the Board.

Mr. Lizotte questioned if presenting an article would be perceived as a "power grab."

Ms. Brown stated she is not sure it is prudent to present the article without the support of the Selectmen, but perhaps an article should be bookmarked, which would allow more time for deliberation by the Board.

The consensus of the Board was that an article to change the Site Plan Review Authority from the Selectmen to the Planning Board should be submitted.

Site Plan Vote

Mr. Morely stated he believes the requirement for a unanimous vote for Site Plan approval is unfair to businesses. Ms. Kablack noted that Town Counsel has not been supportive of the requirement for a unanimous vote for Site Plan approval. The consensus of the Board was that an article to change the bylaw to alter a unanimous vote to a majority vote for Site Plan review should be submitted.

Medical Marijuana

The Board agreed to submit an article for a temporary moratorium on permitting medical marijuana dispensaries until after the Dept. of Public Health regulations have been promulgated (approximately 1 year).

Wastewater Facilities Bylaw

It was decided to proceed with a Warrant article to delete the Wastewater Facilities Bylaw, section 4500.

SRC and ISD Bedrooms

Ms. Kablack noted the Council on Aging will submit an article to increase the allowable number of bedroom units from 10% to 25% regarding the SRC and ISD Bylaw.

Sheds

The Planning Board voted to submit an article increasing shed sizes from 12 feet to 16 feet on any side to be allowed to be located five feet from side or rear lot line. The Building Inspector will be asked to present this article at Town Meeting.

Parking Requirements

Ms. Kablack referred to an email dated December 27, 2012 previously provided to the Board, from Sudbury resident and Design Review Board Chair Dan Martin, suggesting a Warrant article be considered to reduce parking requirements. Ms. Kablack stated most applicants request fewer than the required minimum parking spaces. She recommended taking no action at this time and possibly considering the idea later as part of the Route 20 zoning discussions. The Board concurred.

For the Warrant articles the Board decided to proceed with tonight, Ms. Kablack circulated signature pages for the Board to sign.

Adoption of 2013 Bonding Policy

The Board was previously in receipt of copies of a letter, dated December 18, 2012, from Town Engineer/DPW Director William I. Place, which updated the 2012 Bonding Policy to reflect 2013 unit prices and a copy of the current 2012 unit prices as presented in a letter from Mr. Place dated December 14, 2011.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To approve the 2013 Bonding Policy unit prices as presented by Department of Public Works Director/Town Engineer William I. Place, in a letter dated December 18, 2012.

2012 Planning Board Annual Report

The Board was previously in receipt of a Draft 2012 Sudbury Planning Board Annual Report.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

VOTED: To approve the 2012 Planning Board Annual Report as reviewed tonight.

Minutes

Chairman Fee suggested, and the Board concurred, that several small revisions noted be made to the December 12, 2012 meeting minutes.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To approve the meeting minutes of December 12, 2012, as amended tonight.

Miscellaneous **590 Hudson Road**

The Board was previously in receipt of copies of maps of the 590 Hudson Road area. Ms. Kablack stated the property is zoned Industrial District currently and the owner would like to sell the property. She asked the Board to think about what it would like to see at this location in the future and to let her know of any ideas. The site may be appropriate for small houses or duplex units, although no zoning is in place for such use. The Board thought contractor yard would be appropriate, and similar to the current use.

Upcoming Meeting Schedule

The Board's next regular meeting is scheduled for February 27, 2013, to be held at the Flynn Building at 7:30 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned by Chairman Fee at 10:28 p.m.