

**Meeting Minutes**

**February 27, 2008**

Present: Christine Santoro, Chair; Colin Gillis, Clerk; Walter Johnson, Gregory Strange, Carol Symmons

Staff: Marc Rousseau, Director Planning & Community Development; Alice Savage, Staff Planner; Pamela Almeida, Recording Secretary

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**QUESET COMMONS SMART GROWTH PROJECT – 40R**

Present: Douglas A. King, Adam Costa of Blatman, Brobowski & Mead, LLC; Mark Bartlett of Norfolk RAM Group

Christine Santoro opened the public hearing and welcomed the public. Colin Gillis read the following public hearing notice. See notice attached to the minutes.

Christine Santoro explains that the process of amending the zoning law is a multi-step process.

1. The Town of Easton submits an application to the State. The State then to designate a district as a 40R district. This step has been completed and with the State. The State's input here is to say that the location (Rte 138/Rte 123) is an area they think would be appropriate or not.
2. A public hearing is scheduled to review the bylaw with members of the Board and the public. Tonight will hear from our Staff Planner, Attorney Costa, Mark Bartlett.
3. During the public hearing, any proposed changes, either by the Town or the State are reviewed and subsequently approved. The public hearing may or may not be closed at the end of tonight's hearing.
4. If the district is recommended by the Planning Board to the Board of Selectmen, it will go the Town Meeting for vote of the public.

5. If the Town votes for (must have a 2/3 vote), it then goes to the Attorney General's office for review and further changes may be made by the Attorney General's office.
6. The Design Standards are then developed with the help of the Planning Board's staff. The Design Standards determine what the project may look like.
7. A proponent then submits a project application; at that point, the project would come before the Approval Authority.

We will begin tonight by explaining Chapter 40R.

Adam Costa of Blatman, Brobowski, & Mead explains that he has been retained to provide some legal and financial assistance for the project. He states that specifically he would like to echo the comments made by Christine Santoro, that this is a lengthy process, Ch. 40R both statute and the regulations. He states that the first part of the process is what, perhaps, many have read about. He explains that to begin the 40R process, in this case, the developer came before the Town with a particular proposal and the specifics of that proposal were to together in the form of an application approved by the Board of Selectmen to the Department of Housing and Community Development. All that has been received are two forms of communications; 1. A letter from the Department (DHCD) that the application was complete which was received in early January, 2. The second communication letter saying that they had reviewed the letter and the application and provided comments for some items in the application. Specifically many of the comments related to the zoning. He reiterates that this is a long process and there has been no State approval for a 40R district, nor has the developer received approval for any project.

His second comment is that the 40R district which is being proposed is not one in the same of any particular project that is being suggested for the site. Generally 40R is adopted by the legislature with the idea that a municipality would look to 40R and the financial incentives that are offered as an opportunity to create more dense and affordable housing. How it is actually functioned in practice is a bit different. Rather than the municipality taking the first step, the developer has seen this as an opportunity to construct this denser or more affordable housing in certain particular areas in Town that may qualify under the States guidelines'. With particular projects in mind, the developer has come to the municipality and suggested that the Town take the steps necessary to create the 40R district. And very often do much of the leg work.

So, what is being presented tonight, Queset Commons and potential projects on the site, but none of those specific project items is going to be decided at this stage. 40R does describe a minimum density, and that is something that is included in our draft zoning and will be voted on at Town Meeting. But with respect to project specifics and approvals that are required, that require a new process and that is a process that has been created through the 40R bylaw. There is a specific section in the zoning bylaw that creates the Planned Approval Authority, it is a new body and made up of Boards in Town and it sits on an application that has been presented to the PAA and the PAA has a process whereby it reviews the specific project application and determines whether or not complies with the 40R bylaw and design standards that have been adopted by the Town with respect to the 40R district.

So that is an entire process that has not begun tonight and cannot be done tonight because the bylaw has not been passed. That is something that will occur at a later date and will provide the opportunity, in the event this 40R district and passes, for comments on the specifics on a project.

He introduces Mark Bartlett who will review some specifics of the area that is being proposed for the 40R district. The purpose again for tonight's meeting is to discuss the zoning bylaw, which is the piece that will go before Town Meeting and the reason for this meeting being held because Ch.40A requires that this Board hold a public hearing on a zoning amendment and that is what this would be. So, once the brief overview of the district and the area it is proposed for, we will then get into more specifics of the zoning piece and comments back from DHCD about the zoning piece and some clarification since receiving the comments back from DHCD.

Mark Bartlett presents a proposed project slide show for the site presently waiting 40R district approval by the State. He explains the location is at the intersection of Route 138 and Route 123. The site is 60.7 acres with 27% of it consisting of ponds and wetlands, 24% is already developed, 49% is proposed with 3 zones (residential, commercial and a mixed use zone). The location is planned for mixed use, with compact building designs, multiple housing types, including affordable housing. The site will be considered a 'walk able neighborhood' and development of the site is intended to preserve open space. He explains that other options of the development for the site could be, what he called Option A having 4 - Estate Lots and/or Option B as a cluster development (with up to 48 - 2 bedrooms units). Neither or which would require 40R. He shows a slide comparing the three options.

He explains that the BETA Engineering group, under the Selectmen's direction, wanting to know if this area makes sense for this type of district in regards to adequate water supply, traffic mitigation, stormwater management and waste water management. The firm had reviewed all of the issues aggressively and concluded to the Board of Selectmen reported this district in this area is feasible.

In summary he reports benefits to the Town:

1. This first benefit came from the Town's financial consultant who was hired by the Board of Selectmen to review this zoning financially. And basically resulted in a favorable impact of .40 cents for every dollar of revenue to the Town.
2. There is a onetime incentive of \$350,000 for establishing this type of zoning, and then \$3,000 for every permit pulled. (280 units x \$3,000).
3. The planned discussed in a mixed use area. The area will be walk able, also a bus service is proposed.
4. The project will be proposed with underground parking and affordable housing.
5. Traffic mitigation plan has been accepted through the Town's review Engineers.
6. There will be 6 acres of open space
7. A walking trail will be proposed.
8. Proposing low impact stormwater management

9. Proposing to have a membrane bioreactive system. A very high level quality of treatment. Will treat the waste water for the entire 40R district. Also proposing to the Town, if they choose, to take waste water from other areas into this system.
10. There will be a donation of a 1.2 acre parcel to the Town for a Fire Station.

Alice Savage went over a couple of ways this is different from the regular zoning. The first thing is the QSGOD meaning that the underlying zoning to residential, commercial remains in place until such time that the as soon as a building permit is pulled under the 40R district, the regular zoning then no longer applies, the 40R zoning applies to the site.

She brings up the revisions of the 40R zoning bylaw by the DHCD and would like to discuss them at this time.

Adam Costa states that he has received a number of revisions from Don Schmidt, the Director of the Smart Growth Zoning program at DHCD. He states that this process between DHCD and his office is ongoing and back and forth and suggests to keep the public hearing open beyond this evening because any changes made tonight will have to go back to DHCD for approval.

He makes refers to the sections of the bylaw for most recent revisions:

Section A – Purpose                      No significant changes

Section B – Definitions                One significant change was made with regard to Design Standards and will be discussed later

Section C – Overlay District        No significant changes

Section D – Housing and Affordability      Under item #3. – Requirements – the following was requested by the Easton Housing Partnership and is consistent with the recommendation of the Easton Affordable Housing Planning Production Plan (2005)

e. at least 10% of the Affordable Housing Units shall be handicapped-accessible.

Section E – Permitted and Prohibited Uses      Suggest to add item 4:

Substantially Developed Land – for Substantially Developed Land, the construction of infill housing on existing vacant lots, and of additional housing units in existing residential buildings or additions thereto or replacements thereof, shall be permitted as of right. The allowable residential densities in such Substantially Developed Land shall be equal to those set forth in the underlying zoning. The adoption of the QSGOD shall supersede the use regulations applicable in the underlying zoning to the extent necessary to permit such residential uses as of right.

Section F – Density                      No significant changes

Section G – Required Integration of Uses & Market Rate & Subsidized Dwelling Units

No significant changes

Section H – Signs This item has been addressed in both the QSGOD zoning and the Design Standards. It is recommended deleting this Section and rely on the regulations found in Draft #5 of the Design Standards.

Section I – Surfacing, Drainage and Curbing This item has been addressed in both the QSGOD zoning and the Design Standards. It is recommended deleting this Section and rely on the regulations found in Draft #5 of the Design Standards.

Section J – Traffic and Pedestrian Safety Referring to item 4. Pedestrians; bicycles This item has been addressed in the Design Guidelines. It recommends either deleting this section (j.4) or replacing it with sections 8.A and 8.C of the proposed Design Standards.

Section K – Dimensional Regulations No significant changes.

Section L – Off-Street Parking and Loading Regulations

Suggest to add item 6. Shared Parking –

Shared parking may be applied when land uses have different parking demand patterns and are able to use the same parking spaces/areas throughout the day. Shared parking is most effective when these land uses have significantly different peak parking characteristics that vary by time of day, day of week, and/or season of the year. In these situations, shared parking strategies will result in fewer total parking spaces needed when compared to the total number of spaces needed for each land use of business separately. Shared parking is a strategy that can significantly reduce the amount of land devoted to parking while providing a number of spaces and encouraging compact land development. For multiple uses, the number of parking spaces required shall be determined by a study prepared by the applicant following the procedures of the Urban Land Institute Shared Parking Report, ITE Shared Parking Guidelines, or other accepted procedures approved by the Plan Approval Authority.

Section M – Application for Plan Approval

One comment on item #1. Pre-Application

the term “natural resource areas’ (m 1.b) is not defined and needs definition.

Section N – Procedures No significant changes

Section O – Design Standards

One comment suggesting adding some language spelling out the amendment process for Design Standards.

Section P – Decision      No significant changes

Section Q – Change in Plans after Approval by PAA      No significant changes

Section R – Enforcement; Appeal

One suggested change to the first sentence, change Building Commission to Zoning Enforcement Officer.

Section S – Severability      No significant changes

Comments and questions from the Planning Board began:

Gregory Strange voiced his approval of the project but felt that under this bylaw the Planning Board will have little say in it approval or design.

He asked for an explanation of objective design and subjective design.

Adam Costa responded that the PAA is a 3 member board usually made up of a member from the Planning & Zoning Board, Zoning Board of Appeals and Board of Selectmen. He states that, however, there is no requirement of who makes up the PAA.

Walter Johnson addressed concerns referring to a meeting with Wayne Southworth, DPW Director and Jack Marsh, Water Superintendent regarding water re-use, leaching fields and the water table level in this area.

Mark Bartlett responds to the proposed treatment plant after it treats the water to dispose the water into a leaching field. The site has had a number of test pits, percolation test and soil examination records are available, that show the area suitable for this type of disposal. He reports there have also been a number of borings done, both deep and shallow, to confirm the hydrogeology of the site.

Regarding water use in the Town, he has spoken with Wayne Southworth and questions have been asked of how this project will handle irrigation. He states that one of the aspects to preserve water is to take water runoff, hold it in cisterns that the water can be pumped from for irrigation. Therefore should not have to use Town water at all for irrigation. Irrigation, water conservation devices will be installed throughout the facility as it is being built. The most important aspect is if the clean water will be charged back into the aquifer? This is a principal of the Department Environmental Protection who is very emphatic about keeping water and water sheds safe.

Carol Symmons asked if what was just explained will be put into the Design Standards.

Mark Bartlett responds that it can be incorporated into the Design Standards.

Colin Gillis voiced a concern that came from the Water Department. The state monitors and controls the amount of water that can be pumped from the town system each day. The State is the controlling factor; they dictate exactly how many gallons that can be pumped. With this in mind, if there is a way in which we could amend how the State allocates how much water can be pumped. One of the ways is the water discharged. If there is a way to monitor how much water is being conserved and put back into the system, perhaps a case can be made to the State and the Town may be able to receive credit for it.

Mark Bartlett believes that what is being referred to is the Water Management permit that the State has to renew every few years and DEP is getting more aggressive about water management control throughout the State. Therefore Wayne and the Water Department will have to keep that under control, not just for this project, but for the Town which has to have a plan to conserve water, encourage water re-use and encourage less irrigation. So there is a public education component with that. What is being suggested on this project could work. We are going to monitor discharge and irrigation use and will have all the records. This type of high density housing has the benefit of managing water conservation through types of plumbing fixtures and devices put installed.

Alice Savage asked how the design standards adopted into the bylaw.

Adam Costa responded that a Town Meeting vote is needed to incorporate them into zoning at a later date.

Gregory Strange asked if there are a designated number of affordable units. Adam Costa responds that there is no requirement for zoning, but Douglas King responds that there is a State requirement on a certain number of affordable units.

Gregory Strange asked if there will be any irrigation from Town water. Mark Bartlett responds that the plan is not to.

Gregory Strange asked about Design Standards (pg. 21, section 0.1) talks about the design standards need to be approved by the PAA. Adam Costa responds that there is no specific requirement in the regulations or statute.

Gregory Strange last comment was in regard to 'spot zone' or 'sub zone' sort of a gateway to Easton, or ties into the NRT property and Morse Pond, in the bylaw, it allows by Special Permit, Communication Towers. Would not want to see a 200 foot tower there, if it is allowed perhaps it could be concealed somehow.

Christine Santoro asks that in regards to Special Permits and a list of uses, since this is a whole district where we are proposing specific rules and regulations, she would think that a special

permit would be something that the would need to be approved. She asked if Marc Rousseau or Alice Savage would respond.

Alice stated that on page 9, Section E. – Permitted and Prohibited Uses. Anywhere in the table of uses where the letters SP are designated, will require a special permit. But there is no procedure that talks about what the process is. In the table of uses, most items do not require a Special Permit, the exceptions are:

1. Gas stations (in subzone C) but recommends this not be allowed as there are enough gas stations in the area already
2. Automobile repairs shops (in subzone C), also recommends this not be allowed in this area.

Those that presently do require a Special Permit and Alice recommends for further discussion to the next meeting are

1. Communication Tower and Wireless Communications Facility.
2. Any use listed involving toxic or hazardous material in quantities greater than those associated with normal household use, as regulated by Section 5-5 of the Zoning Bylaw, Aquifer Protection Districts.
3. Home Occupation (in sub zones A&B) in regards to the addition to the residents of the premises, has not more than one additional employee; and produces reasonable customer, pupil or client trip to the occupation site as governed by Section 7-8 of the Easton Zoning By-Law.

Christine Santoro had one other comment on the 5<sup>th</sup> version of the bylaw, she if of the opinion that the Planning Board is the experience Board and thinks it is important they be the Approval Authority for this project. She is open to expand the number of members, but truly feels the Planning Board should be the Approval Authority.

With no further questions from the Board Christine Santoro opens the floor to the public.

Kyla Bennett, Vice Chair of the Easton Conservation Commission read a statement from the Conservation Commission. Please see the statement attached to the minutes. The comments are based on a review of Draft #5.

Diane Howard of 14 Eisenhower Drive. She begins that the Easton Journal had an article dated February 22, 2008 with the headline “State ok’s Queset Commons – Chamber Hears Project Plans” which states “Developer Douglas King, told a group with about 75 Easton Chamber of Commerce members, Thursday February 14, 2008, that the State approved for his proposed affordable housing project, Queset Commons.” She says that this is not true; the State has not approved this project. She also states that the Historical Commission at last night’s meeting

voted to preserve the historically significant residence that has been referred to as “the site of the a new fire station”. She goes on the say that we are here to discuss the new zoning classification for the Town of Easton, referred to as “Smart Growth”, in her opinion; this is “dumb growth” zoning as it does not belong in this Town. Recently there has been two locations being considered for 40R Smart Growth zoning, one is referred to as Queset Commons, located on Route 138/Washington Street and Route 123, the other is located in the Shovel Shop Square area. Please see the statement attached to the minutes.

Ellen Dahlgren, 18 Harrison Avenue asked “does changing the bylaw to accommodate one developer’s project show preferential treatment to that developer, especially when the project has not been approved by the State?”

Colin Gillis responds that “the 40R was enacted with the idea in mind that any developer could come forward with a 40R plan.”

Ellen Dahlgren, 18 Harrison asked “would the Town of Easton require a bond or some kind of insurance policy be provided to cover any potential pollution or damage to the Town’s water supply and any impact on other Town’s?”

Christine Santoro responds that “a bond is required for roadways.”

Colleen Corona, Chairperson, Board of Selectmen – Two comment’s – 1. feels that the Planning Board should be responsible for the project. Secondly a comment referring eligibility for affordable housing does not equate to questionable character. Many people are eligible for affordable housing and are of very good character, those two things being linked together are disturbing. Affordable housing eligibility could be a policeman’s salary, a teacher’s salary, a firefighter’s salary and to link affordable housing and questionable character is offensive.

Mary Fitzgerald, a member of the Housing Partnership Committee and Historical Commission. She gave a brief statement on behalf of the HPC. The HPC makes recommendations that are consistent with the Town’s affordable housing booklet, which are described in Easton’s Affordable Housing Production Plan. Basically, we brief proposed affordable housing projects and make sure that nothing is overlooked. The HPC recommends this project, we think it is a very smart project and hopes it goes through.

Christopher Kone, 4 Hollis Road – He wanted clarifications:

1. The Table of Uses Regulations, he asked if it implemented all the uses in the 40R bylaw. Alice Savage answered “Yes”.
2. bout 15-20 years ago, the Board of Selectmen was concerned with was Adult Entertainment and throughout the zoning bylaw as now written, adult entertainment will be entwined within the zoning bylaw rather than restricted to a smaller area, and don’t know if this will then release the restrictions of adult entertainment with the implementation of the Table of Uses and Regulations with the 40R bylaw.
3. The Aquifer Protection, this does not explain the Aquifer Protection bylaw. Alice Savage responds that it does. He responds “that then this property itself is within the Aquifer

Protection District. Given that the makeup of the Town of Easton wouldn't it be possible to include the Aquifer Protection requirements, because I think that part of what Conservation was including with the prohibited uses, although they didn't state all the prohibited uses. Alice Savage responds that anything that is not listed in the Table of Uses and Regulations is prohibited. Mr. Kone feels that when this goes to Town meeting he feels that this is something that needs to be sown up as to how the existing protections under the zoning bylaw are going to continue in this 40R bylaw. He thinks it could possibly be a particular weakness. For example, the Adult Entertainment.

Mark Bartlett responds that we do need to assure that Aquifer Protection District is carried over. The only issue is perhaps the smart growth require a high level treatment and be specific and that if we have that all of the other issues (i.e. auto repair, companies with hazardous waste) obviously we don't want that in this zone. I think we need to live and die by the Aquifer Protection District except that one component of the aquifer protection district prohibits treatment plants. So we are saying that should be back in, but go ahead and put a standard on it, it would have to be very high level treatment standards.

Donald Bennett, 2 Chickadee Lane – comments made at the Selectmen's meeting, but this development affects a lot of people because of the effect on the water supply. But not only is it going to tax our water supply, close to 4 million extra gallons a year taken from the water supply. But we have issues that we think, recharging is a good idea. One of the quandaries is that currently there is no known technology that removes pharmaceuticals and personal care products from the water supply. Fascinated by the document the applicant provided to the Town talking about the sewage treatment technology that are going to use because it had 31 commonly used pharmaceuticals in this study, only 9 of those 31 compounds were significantly impacted by the sewage treatment. There is yet another issue that is starting to become concerning, if you go to the MASSDEP website there is a new comment on PPCP's (pharmaceuticals and personal care products) and also endocrines disrupting compounds. Now endocrines, the EPA just pointed out that there are about 62,500 of them that are so small that they are not filtered out by membrane technology and we should be concerned about them. He reads a statement "other than the fact that right now, there are no known treatment technologies capable of removing these compounds, although at the national level research is underway, that according to the AWWA (American Water Works Association) given that even trace concentrations of PPCP's and endocrine disrupting compounds may affect human health." There observed affect on fish and amphibians and there continued presence of some compounds after waste water treatment processes, the consensus in the drinking water community is they deserve close study and possible mitigation efforts. So we want to put something that deserves close study and mitigation study on top of our wells in Zone II. I think Zone II is the line that goes through the sewage/drainage (refers to the Queset Commons proposed site plan). Another comment from the AWWA is that are there PPCP's and endocrine disruptive compounds in the water and if so, do they propose a risk to my health? AWWA responds that low dose and common exposure to these compounds in humans have not been both studied. An additionally concern regarding human health is whether exposure of PPCP's and EDC's is increasing antibiotic resistance in pathogens." Bacteria is resistant, antibiotics are not broken down and get into the water supply, posing concerns to our health and just the bacteria that are out there. So, thinks this really

deserves consideration at the Planning Board sense that we are putting dense population with elderly housing on top of our water supply. I happen to be a scientific researcher in the pharmaceutical industry, so my whole life is looking at the toxicity of compounds and I can almost guarantee that in five to ten years there will be regulations on these compounds and it would be a tragedy discovering that we decided to put a dense populated and elderly house on top of our wells and decrease the quality of life.

Mark Bartlett addressed Mr. Bennett's point by referring to some slides. He informs the public that he is an Environmental Engineer for 30 years and is concerned with the public's health and safety. He refers to a slide on PPCP's that to date, scientists have found no evidence of adverse human effects from PPCP's in the environment. Another slide shows that AWWA professionals now have technology to detect these compounds in the water. He shows another slide showing the size of the aquifer, which is huge in scope. He says that this issue is something the Town has had to deal with, what the project is proposing is to raise the level of treatment to the waste water. He shows a slide showing the 'improved wastewater treatment' and improved aquifer recharge'. Another slide shown compares nitrogen loading to aquifer from existing and proposed development. He feels that the plan for wastewater does address this issue.

Kyla Bennett, 2 Chickadee Lane, as a resident – agrees nitrogen removal would be a benefit if a wastewater treatment plant is put at the site. The wastewater treatment plan that is being proposed does not remove PPCP's and EDC's, not talking about nitrogen. Yes, a wastewater treatment will benefit the Town with regards to nitrogen; we are talking about something that has the potential to be much more dangerous. With regards to EPA's website, I have a PhD. In biology, she also has a law degree in environmental law, and worked for EPA for ten years, until eight months ago, EPA's website said there was no such thing as global warming. If EPA says that PPCP's are not a problem, does not believe it. MASSDEP, under Governor Patrick, says it is a concern. MassDEP is currently participating in a study with UMass Amherst and Earth Tech to examine twelve PPCP's. There are hundreds of thousands of these chemicals. They are looking at twelve because that is all they can afford to do right now, to look at treatment efficiency (as reported from their website) as well as whether treatment produces potentially harmful dauber compounds. It is possible that the treatment of these PPCP's may cause harmful compounds. Nitrogen is not the question. PPCP's and EDC's are the question. Anyone can talk to Dr. Joel Tickner, at UMass who says these are an issue. We are talking about our Zone II, our Aquifer Protection District. I am not saying that Mr. King shouldn't be allowed not do a 40R, it might be a good think for the Town, but not on top of our Zone II, not on top of our Aquifer Protection, we are talking about dense development, assisted living, medical facilities with laboratories, the amount of PPCP's and EDC's will come out of this development is too scary to take the risk. We need to use a precautionary principal here and say this is the wrong place to put this kind of development.

Christopher Kone – regarding the Aquifer District, he states that it was probably 1988-89 that meeting were held to develop the Aquifer Protection District and have to think more of the bylaw anywhere in the Town as opposed to this area. So the APD is an overlay district all throughout the Town and the Town went to great lengths to determine where the APD should be to protect the wells. And to supplant that with this, which is called an overlay district, even though it is not

an overlay district, an overlay district includes all those things underneath, this is a new district which supplants all the other district requirements, and I think that the actions we took to create the APD should not be ignored and be included within this district. How it affects whatever happens within the district is however it affects the district, but it is something I think should not be ignored.

Donald Bennett – anything on the Queset Commons slide that does not say 99% means it is getting into the water supply. What the State has to say in general is any environmental containment that is shown to be or is likely to be biologically or environmentally active at low concentrations is more likely for higher risks. Particular concerned about chemicals that have an impact children's health. Almost every house in this Town is feeding off of these wells and will be drinking this water with potentially toxic compounds in it and we are putting it on top of our wells in a dense population.

Jane Sullivan, 75 Center Street – (directed question to Donald Bennett) she states that it is her understanding that our septic systems are leaking into our water supply. So we now have an elderly population, essentially in a very densely populated area with all those items being concerned about this is happening as we speak. So why not buy property in a Town that has town sewage?

Donald Bennett states that this is a personal question. But he purchased property in Easton because it has more conservation land than any other town in the north shore. He is saying he is aware of containments happening now, but why add more? Not a great idea.

Gregory Strange says that unfortunately the society we live in and the environment we created in there is an inherited risk and agrees with not putting risks on top of sensitive area, but we have to look at reality of development. At least in this option, we have control of a treatment plan that we can require to upgrade and change, versus if it is a 40B we have no say. It would be great if nothing was ever built again and stay open space, but that is not reality and wondering if a better option for us is to go in a direction of where we have control as things may change up the road and technology improves.

Christine Santoro asks if there are any further questions from the public.

Adam Costa asks that in the interest of moving forward with this in preparation for Town Meeting, if the Board can come to some sort of conclusion as to some changes made to the bylaw that may be more acceptable to the Board and the residents of the Town.

Marc Rousseau suggests the need to work in the design standards.

Alice Savage suggests one more public hearing to look at the design standards.

Collin Gills motions to continue the public hearing to March 12, 2008, seconded by Walter Johnson.

Planning & Zoning Board  
Meeting Minutes, 2/27/08

Walter Johnson motions to adjourn at 8:45 p.m., seconded by Colin Gillis.

Respectfully submitted by *Pamela J. Almeida, Recording Secretary*

Signed By,

*Colin Gillis*

May 21, 2008

---

Colin Gillis, Clerk

---

Date