

The regular meeting of the Bridgewater Planning Board virtually convened at 6:30 pm.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Driscoll, Chairman; Mr. Ajemian, Vice-Chair; Ms. Guarino, Clerk; Mr. Geller, member; Mr. MacDonald, Member; Astrid Rojas, Associate Member

ALSO PRESENT: Ms. Farinacci, Assistant Planner; Ms. Burke, CED Director, Ms. Dorr, Office Administrator and Mr. Etoniru, Town Engineer

Mr. Driscoll read from prepared text on Governor Bakers order of 3/12/2020 and how the meeting will be conducted, rules of procedure and how to be able to speak at the meeting.

OLDFIELD, PHASE II MODIFICATION PUBLIC HEARING

The hearing notice appeared in the Enterprise on 3/ 24 and 3/31.

On Wednesday, March 17, 2021 at 6:30 pm, the Bridgewater Planning Board will be conducting a public hearing via zoom on application by Oldfield Estates, LLC, Robert Long, for a major modification of the approved subdivision known as Oldfield, II. The modifications include: the construction of a swale behind lots 48-51; the construction of an infiltrating catch basin behind the mail kiosk; the construction of a drainage pipe which outlets behind the stormwater basin and the addition of 11 gravel parking spaces to access the open space trails.

Attorney Castignetti explained that there was an excess amount of water running down behind those lots from the open space and was constantly puddling. He asked Evan to evaluate it and it turns out that the runoff had not been calculated in the original design. As an attempt to address it midstream, they put a swale on the back of their yards. Evan designed a methodology to bring it across the street to get it to the open space where the initial flow of water was designed to go. Mr. Etoniru had sent an email which read: "I have reviewed the proposed drainage system modification plan for the above subject location dated January 19, 2021 by Prime Engineering, Inc. (Prime). The modification plan seeks to install a grass swale to intercept stormwater runoff/breakout along the southerly side of lots 48, 49, 50 and 51. The swale will convey the intercepted stormwater runoff to an area shallow drainage basin fitted with a drywell (recharge pit). The area basin is located within the subdivision's open space. Overflow runoff from the drainage basin will be routed through a series of drainage conduits down to the existing drainage basin on the north side of lots 9, 10 and 11. The applicant has on his own, installed a section of the overflow drainage conduit within an easement on lot 11. While the design of the drainage modification plan appears technically sound, its practical and operational effectiveness would be cumbersome for two or three reasons: **1**, a significant portion of the proposed swale and the drainage basin are to be in an open space area adjacent to trail(s) for pedestrian use and passive recreation. The swale and the drainage basin could pose a trip hazard to the public, especially when they go unmaintained for a significant amount of time and overgrown with bushes and trees. The drainage basin is more than four (4) feet in depth, with a seven (7) ft deep recharge pit underneath the basin. **2**, The segment of the swale on lots 48 through 51 is not likely to be maintained, given its remote location."

Evan Watson explained the design. He said if this had been discovered prior to constructing the detention basin, they could have made adjustments to accommodate the additional run off. The added

overflow pipe does not tie into the existing storm sewer or add any stormwater. He said he could understand Azu's concern about the depth of the infiltration area and he understands that because he mislabeled the contour as 56, rather than 59.7, so the depression is only 1 ½ ft. deep and probably wouldn't even notice it as you walked by. He spoke about Azu's concern about the maintenance of the swale; he said it was going to be an easement which will be maintained by the Homeowners Association.

Mr. Etoniru was present. He said that from an analytical and design standpoint, it makes sense. He said he would like to see the bottom elevation of the basin noted at the 59.7 on the plan, because the 56.5 elevation as noted now will make it 4 ½ feet deep. It is close to the parking area and the walking trail adjacent to it, won't fit very well with the area. He said even if you have a shallow basin, you still have the recharge pit that is 7' deep at the bottom of that basin and he is not quite comfortable with the grate in the middle of the open space area where people will be traversing, unless that grate is designed with a hot tipped galvanized steel that will not be subject to corrosion with a locking grate and frame, then it might be entertained, he said. He said he wanted to remind the board that although he inspected that pipe installation, it was being installed without a modification and the applicant noted that it was a risk that they were willing to take because of scheduling constraints with their contractor. As far as the issue of maintenance, that subdivision road will be part of the street acceptance and he doesn't think it was approved to be maintained by an association, so he is not sure how that would be imposed on the association when it was designed and anticipated to be accepted. He said he does not see a cross section detail of the swale on the plan. He referred to the picture of the swale; it is not your typical swale that would be in a lawn area that is not as prone to vegetative cover from trees on the embankment; so as those trees go thru shedding their foliage, that whole area of the swale might not last that long which is a concern he might have.

Mr. Driscoll spoke about the open space that abuts the Jenny Lenard Park; he believes that the last time we discussed this, they were asked to separate that from the neighborhood mailbox area, because he believes the Town of Bridgewater has the first right of refusal on it to be added to the park for access and parking.

Mr. Driscoll asked Mr. Etoniru if he saw any downside other than the grate to having the structure on the open space that the Town may take? Mr. Etoniru said his concern was the depth of that basin but given the fact that we found out that it is only 1 ½ feet deep and we treat the grate properly, he wouldn't have a problem with it. Mr. Castignetti interjected to emphasize Evan's comment that it was a mistake showing it at the 56.9; it is at 59.5 and 1 ½ feet deep. It will be on a very rare occasion that it will hold water, but, if it does, it will be for a very short period of time. They will be very willing to accommodate on the design grate of that cover, he said.

Mr. Ajemian suggested that the hearing be continued so Azu and Evan can go over the design and see how best to handle this. Mr. Etoniru agreed.

There was nobody in the chat who wished to speak.

On a motion by Mr. Ajemian, seconded by Ms. Guarino, it was unanimously voted by roll call vote to continue this hearing to April 7th at 6:30 pm.) NOTE- it was discovered the next day that abutters were not notified by the applicant. A new hearing will be held on 4/7.

BROAD STREET PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUATION

The public hearing reconvened at 7:05 pm.

Mr. Driscoll requested that comments be limited to three minutes.

Troy Clarkson stated that after the last meeting there were several things that needed to be submitted. He said they attended the ZBA meeting, and they did grant the requested 13 additional units, so the Transfer of Development Rights is now before you. In addition to that, there were some additional questions and filings that the Town asked them to make including some clarifications on parking, on the landscaping and some information on their deliberations with the town on the potential density bonuses. He asked if there were any comments or questions from the Board members on the additional information submitted?

Mr. Silva from SEA provided some additional information on the parking lot drainage. At the last meeting, there were two items needed to be addressed: one was the complete calculations for the ground water mounding in response to some concerns expressed by Mr. Etoniru on the old Friendly's parking lot area and on the east side having test pits done, with Mr. Etoniru present, in order to determine the adequacy of the drainage. The test pits were conducted, and they were able to determine the depth to high ground water and look at the function of the existing drainage system. Based upon that, they have made changes to the parking lot to provide water quality and a drainage system that would be higher than the original one to take into account the conditions that they found and any mounding that may occur during the drainage inflow. Details of that were done and provided to the Town for review. Rebecca and Azu worked out the mounding conditions across the street. Issues of safety were brought up and how pedestrian flow was going to occur. They have provided two crosswalks by bumping out the street in two areas; one near Hale street and one near what is known as the old bowling alley that adjoins over to the parking lot. (from G to A and between D and E going over to Hale Street). They have provided controls there and suggesting LED active crossing signs that will alert drivers that somebody is in the crosswalk.

Mr. Driscoll questioned the type of curbing in parking lot A. Rebecca said it is shown as vertical, but what material they would use was not discussed. She does not have it labeled, so it could go either way. Mr. Etoniru noted that it must be vertical granite at Broad Street; it is private property, so it would be up to the applicant what is used within the parking lot itself. He has no particular preference. Mr. Driscoll asked Ms. Burke if all the roadwork for bump outs and crosswalks in conjunction with the project would be outside the mitigation? She said that was correct; she said it was her understanding that if it is shown on the plan, it is in addition.

Mr. Silva noted that the lighting is shown on the utility plan.

Mr. Ajemian commented that he feels this project is most important for the town and he isn't going to be rushed into a decision. He said if there was a call for a vote tonight, he would vote no because he is not ready yet to make that decision until he has some questions answered. He just wanted to make that clear, as comments have been made that we have everything we need, and we should vote this evening. He asked Mr. Paskell if the property was for sale as there are two signs on Broad Street? Mr. Clarkson answered on behalf of the applicant. He said the simple answer is yes; This had been a long process and they have worked very closely with the Town and Mr. Paskell has invested a significant amount of funds

in trying to move this project forward and he is simply protecting his interests by gauging the interest in selling the property if the project doesn't move forward.

Mr. Ajemian noted that if you look at the site, the land adjacent to the old Friendly's is mounded; it looks to him to be about 4-5 feet higher than the street; he asked if they intended taking it down? Mr. Silva was unsure of the question; he said they show contours of the buildings, floor elevations and elevations of the parking lot. He said the parking lots are at a different elevation of the land immediately behind it. The contours were looked at and Mr. Silva said we are not talking a substantial difference between the two locations. Mr. Ajemian said it is not a major question; he is a novice and it just looks like the land is much higher than the other. Mr. Silva said that when you look at the Friendly's from the street, it does sit up a little bit higher; it is not down at street level. It would be comparable to what you are seeing in terms of elevation change. The mass of the new building is bigger but is still about the same in terms of relationship to Broad Street.

Mr. Ajemian questioned the TDR and read from the State guidelines and asked what is the Town of Bridgewater getting? It says that the open space is permanently protected and asked what is being protected? He said we are transferring development rights from the east side to the west side and asked what is being protected on the east side? Ms. Burke explained that is not the only reason for Transfer of Development rights; that is one reason to allow it, but the State allows for additional reasons. Ms. Burke commented that the public parking lot would be in the public good. Mr. Ajemian asked who is the owner of the parking lot? Mr. Clarkson said the developer. Mr. Ajemian questioned if there would be dedicated spaces for the tenants? Mr. Clarkson said no. Ms. Burke said there are no spaces required for them; all residential have parking on their existing lots, except for G which will park on lot F. Mr. Ajemian asked how many spaces total is there? There are 48 spaces. Mrs. Burke said that parking lot A will be utilized by anybody using the commercial space or any public parking up and down Broad Street. Mr. Silva clarified that Mr. Ajemian refers to "dedicated" parking, but that is not the intent in parking lot A; spaces are available to the town, but spaces available to others, he said. It is an open parking lot and not restricted for only the residents across the street. Ms. Burke noted that the benefit is the open parking lot available to the Town for parking. Mr. Clarkson stated that the developer will maintain ownership of the lot and the responsibility of that lot. He clarified that the objective of the TDR has less to do with parking and more to do with allowing the density to occur on the west side of Broad Street in exchange for leaving it open on the east side of Broad St.

Mr. Ajemian questioned the phasing of the development of 10 years in the developer's agreement and why so long a period of time? Mr. Paskell said it won't be that long: it was just that we had a line up to 10 years. Mr. Clarkson said it was to give the developer flexibility to market conditions, what happens with the economy, the availability of capital; Mr. Paskell has a desire to proceed more quickly.

Mr. Ajemian spoke about his concern for the traffic and wanting "no left turn" out of the driveways because it will be dangerous to make a left turn into traffic, and Cumberland Farms and Walgreens are no left turn and having three entrances out on to Broad St. will make it worse; he asked the developer if he had considered only one curb opening rather than three? Mr. Clarkson stated that yes, it was considered, but they wanted to keep the lots separate and distinct. Mr. Ajemian said he is not comfortable with the traffic pattern as proposed.

Mr. Ajemian said he notices that the offices have been taken out of the plans and inserted dining room in the same space; he would assume that the wall would come down, so it couldn't be made into a

bedroom. Mr. Clarkson said that as designed, the apartments comply with the zoning. An additional bedroom isn't allowed and there is no closet, he said. He said someone would not be allowed to put in a door and create a bedroom; that would become an enforcement issue with the town and not a permitting issue.

Mr. Ajemian asked if they were gearing towards a certain demographic for occupancy of these units? Mr. Paskell said they will rely on the market. He would like to see an adult mix of clientele. Mr. Ajemian noted that there was solar proposed on two of the buildings. Mr. Johnson noted that there will be egress windows out to the 3rd floor roof, but no doors. Mr. Ajemian questioned the need for a railing? Mr. Johnson said he will make a note of that to check the code issue. Mr. Clarkson indicated that was part of the discussions with the town on the density bonus. Mr. Ajemian questioned why flat roofs rather than peaked? Mr. Johnson said it was more economical. Mr. Ajemian questioned why the buildings weren't parallel to the street? Mr. Johnson said because they are able to arrange a better parking arrangement, off street parking arrangement and open space. Mr. Ajemian questioned if they had gone to Conservation on the wetlands? Mr. Silva said no; they have identified that there is a small off-site area of wetlands where work needs to be done in that area behind building E and will have to go to Conservation Commission.

Ms. Guarino asked how many parking spaces are provided on the west side? Ms. Burke said one space per unit plus 1 for every three spaces for guests. She questioned the closet shown at the end of the dining room? Mr. Johnson commented that it must have been left over from another plan and this was an error on their part. She commented that the plans say, "solar ready" and she asked if they were going forward with the solar? Mr. Clarkson said that was part of the discussion with the town on the developer's agreement and, at the end of the day, that will be up to the Planning Board. Ms. Guarino asked if they were putting in charging stations in the parking lot? Mr. Paskell said yes.

Mr. MacDonald said he hates to beat the parking to death but wanted to clarify, if on the west side of the street will there be adequate parking spaces for all tenants of buildings D, E, F and G; he asked if retail parking was calculated assuming that the east side lot will be used for parking? Mr. Silva said there is a chart on the plan that gives a breakdown on the parking spaces. He said that the commercial requirements will be met with both the parking across the street and whatever additional parking is available on the west side. Mr. MacDonald asked Larry if he knew how much additional parking would be available for commercial on the west side? Larry said there are 89 parking spaces required for the residential and they have provided 131 total. Mr. Clarkson said that one of the dynamics they are relying on is that some of the residential spaces will be freed up by those people going to work. Mr. MacDonald noted that he sees only 83 residential spaces on the west side. Rebecca said that one space per unit is provided. The 1 per three for guests is the difference. If not provided on site is provided in A. Mr. Silva reminded him that there are also many parking spaces available on Broad Street on both sides.

Mr. Driscoll questioned when the parking lot would be constructed in the sequence of construction on the buildings. Mr. Paskell said that would go along with the first building constructed. (parcel D) Mr. Driscoll stated that if the Board approves the transfer of development rights, you do understand that there will be a deed restriction on the future development of Parcel A. Mr. Paskell said yes. Mr. Driscoll commented that so the Town will have an easement so it can be used for parking needs downtown? Mr. Paskell said yes, per agreement.

Mr. Driscoll noted that the Building Inspector has identified the walk-up staircase with a door at the top, is a potential zoning violation due to height and he recommended a hatch and asked if that is something we can work on the plan? Mr. Johnson said those head houses were initially for an occupied roof and elevator equipment. If we relocate any elevator equipment to the lower levels, and show no roof decks for any occupied space, the code will allow them to do a roof hatch.

As far as the dining room, Mr. Driscoll commented that he is fine with it as long as it remains a dining room. To keep it a dining room and it doesn't become living space, he asked if they were willing to do a floor to ceiling opening so a door could not be installed? Mr. Paskell said it is something they can discuss.

Mr. Driscoll said he looked at the sidewalks and bump outs and questioned if they were outside of the mitigation? Mr. Paskell said he believed they were part of the street scape improvements and are marked and noted as such. Mr. Driscoll questioned what was proposed for the crosswalks and sidewalks in front of the buildings are part of the project, not necessarily part of the street scape mitigation, correct? Mr. Paskell said no, that is all part of the street scape mitigation and he was more than welcome to look at the initial developer's agreement that they signed a couple of years ago and have been part of the discussion ever since. Mr. Driscoll said those were recently added to the plan and he was under the impression that it was outside of the \$350,000. Mr. Driscoll asked Ms. Burke to provide clarification for that? Ms. Burke said she is not aware of any agreements from two years ago so she would have to look into that; she was under the impression that anything shown on the plan and part of the traffic study, it was not part of the developer's agreement. Mr. Driscoll felt it would make a difference in voting on that section of it if it is in addition to part of the plan.

Mr. Driscoll noted that the developer's agreement shows a 10-year development, but the developer's schedule has a development date of 2024 with the mitigation to be received in 2022 roughly 2023 and then 2024. This could potentially go out to 2031. He suggested that any mitigation given after 2024 be tied to the CPI. Mr. Clarkson stated that certainly sounds reasonable, but, that is something that Mr. Paskell would have to answer.

Azu's memo not read, but the only outstanding issue is Conservation.

Public correspondence received from: Mark Linde; James Candito; Beverly Albaugh; Pat Neary; Taylor Sullivan; Donald Gotshalk; Donna Jewell and Janet Hansen

Pat Neary wanted her letter read; Ms. Burke informed her that it was sent to the board members along with the developer. Ms. Neary questioned the discussion this evening how the residential parking on the west side could be used by the general public during the day when residents were at work. She questioned if they were designated as the resident parking for each unit? She asked that be explained or at least kept in mind because it would reduce the public parking available. Mr. Driscoll read into the record her email dated 3/3.

Janet Hanson's letter was shown on the screen; she also expressed parking concerns and the fact that the spaces were up for grabs, rather than being designated. Biggest concern was that the heights of the buildings were too tall for the area.

Kevin Grist-1257 South Street- asked Mr. Paskell what the target market was and the rates? Mr. Paskell

Commented that college kids would not pay for a one bedroom at this level. He has other units around town, and these would be double those. He said he couldn't give a price for them right now, but probably around \$1500+ right now. Mr. Grist asked what is a realistic timeline for the project? Mr. Paskell felt 4-5 years was a very realistic rejection. He commented that it will probably be a challenge for the average person to find a parking spot- he asked if it had been considered sectioning out parking lot 1 with a section being metered and the other for residents? He felt that meters would deter college kids. This was just a thought on his part....needs no answer...just a thought for the town, he said.

Beverly Albaugh-85 Broad Street-she has lived there for 39 years and has been a very keen observer of the traffic conditions that are going on here. She asked Mr. Paskell why is there still a big problem with the tenants that live across from her in the yellow house and the other one across the street? They have no parking, and they are parking in front of her gate, and she asked how she is to get somebody in to mow the lawn in the summertime. There is a sign that says 35-minute parking and they are parking there all night, and nobody is getting a ticket. She questioned how he can solve the parking for the new apartments when he cannot solve the parking problems that exist now.

Mike O'Connor-60 Vera Drive- feels the developer has done what he was asked to do; he commented that this project can tie things together and he hopes it goes through. He said he is a millennial making good money and would love to live in a unit like this, as many other millennials would.

Councilman William Wood- spoke in favor. This will bring business and people downtown. Businesses will benefit and improve our downtown area.

Carlton Hunt spoke in favor. He asked that the following be considered: He felt the parking lot should have electricity and room for a seating area for a possible food truck. He felt maybe the residential parking spaces and the parking lot on the east side should be solarized. The electric parking stations could be charged directly from the sun and the lot should be conditioned as to who can use it; he felt the tenants should be excluded and then questioned how it would be monitored ; he questioned where the retail employees are going to park? He suggested that housing is critical today. Mr. Silva said there is lighting in the east parking lot; he liked the suggestion of parking meters and suggested that residents had some kind of card that would allow them to park and override the meter.

From the chat room- Brian- 14 Corinn Terrace felt the parking should be increased because there will more than likely be two people in a unit.

Mr. Grist asked what are the benefits to the town and the taxpayers other than the parking?

Councilman Wood explained the development bonus points that are tied to activity that the developer is doing for the town. The property next to the Academy Building will become an extended parking lot.

In the chat, Carlton asked if there would be water available in the parking lot to take care of the landscaping. Mr. Silva did not think that had been identified; he said he would defer to Mr. Paskell on how he is going to take care of those areas. Mr. Paskell said that it had not been discussed and they should begin to.

Mr. Driscoll said his only question is and he is not clear on, is that he assumed that anything relating to the project in terms of safety and the crosswalks for that project and the bump outs that are designed for that project and specifically benefit that project would be outside the developer's agreement. He asked Ms. Burke to clarify that.

Mr. Ajemian felt there was a lot of information that has come out at this meeting. He suggested continuing the hearing and if nothing else comes up, we immediately close the hearing and deliberate and decide which way to go.

Mr. Driscoll asked Ms. Burke to draft a decision letter and incorporate what we have discussed to this point so we have it for the next meeting where we will have to look at the developer's agreement and come up with a final mitigation and hopefully vote at the next meeting. He said it would be helpful if the members reviewed all the information received and put their thoughts together so we could discuss and incorporate into the decision.

On a motion by Mr. Ajemian, seconded by Mr. MacDonald, it was unanimously voted by roll call vote to continue the hearing to April 7, 2021 at 7:00 pm.

COVENANT RELEASE REQUEST FOR NORLEN PARK/ GRANGE PARK

Ms. Burke explained the situation as she understood it. Norlen Park modification was a subdivision that was approved with the condition that this parcel remain unbuildable due to drainage concerns. The owner of lots on Grange Park bought some of this open space in order to create two retreat lots which were approved by the Zoning Board of Appeals. The retreat lots are encumbered in the Registry of Deeds by the covenant that was recorded, and they are seeking release of the covenant so the retreat lot can be sold.

Mr. Larry Silva explained that this section of the subdivision was approved back in 2004 and for waiving the length of a cul-de-sac the remaining land of parcel A would be Not a Buildable lot. Somewhere along the line, the new owner of the subdivision, Elliot Schneider, sold some of that backland in Parcel A to Jim Wood in order for him to add it to land he had in Grange Park and the two estate lots were created. One lot has a house on it and when they went to sell the vacant lot, an attorney representing the buyer noted that it was encumbered from land that was from Norlen Park originally. The transfer was done without a plan; it was just a deeded piece of property that went over to the Wood's and then a plan went back to the town for the estate lots and it wasn't picked up at that point. They are trying to get at least that portion released, so it will clear the title for the lot on Grange Park.

Mr. Driscoll questioned Ms. Burke if this should come back before the Planning Board for a modification? Her recommendation to the Board was to seek town counsel advice as she does not know if this is a straightforward release of the lot from the covenant situation.

Attorney Morey, for the applicant, commented that she agreed that some of this is convoluted; it is not a part of the buildable area and has no frontage to the road. In order to clear the title, it has to come back to the Board for a release.

On a motion by Mr. Ajemian, seconded by Mr. MacDonald, it was unanimously voted by roll call vote to have the issue sent to Attorney Rawlins.

Ms. Burke will send the information off to Attorney Rawlins on Friday. Mr. Silva felt it might be beneficial for the attorney to look at the actual, specific language of the restriction that states it is non-buildable, not that anything else could be done to it.

MINUTES NEEDING APPROVAL

On a motion by Ms. Guarino, seconded by Mr. Ajemian, it was unanimously voted by roll call vote to approve the minutes of 2/17/21 and 3/3/21.

Larry Silva requested that anytime an as-built plan that he has prepared has been accepted, that an email be sent to him so there is a paper trail and that they know that they can go forward with an Occupancy permit. Ms. Burke said that we certainly can send him an email that we have signed off.

LOT 27 COVENANT RELEASE FOR OLDFIELD, II

Mr. Castignetti had left the meeting after the modification discussion. He indicated that he would be back for this discussion and provided his number to be called. He was not present.

This is the one lot that was held back based upon the bonding calculations. Ms. Burke said that this bond was calculated about a year ago, so inflation shouldn't be much of a factor at this point. Mr. Driscoll questioned if Mr. Castignetti was going to discuss the open space? Ms. Farinacci advised the board that if he was here, he was going to ask the Board if they prefer the open space be transferred to Wildlands Trust or the Homeowners Association? He did not mind where it went but he didn't know if the Board had a preference. She said that Azu said if the Board wanted the Association to take it, the verbiage in the Homeowners document was sufficient and it would maintain the open space appropriately. Mr. Driscoll felt if they did take it, we would want them to follow the State Conservation Restrictions which would be signed off by the Conservation Commission and the Dept. of Conservation and Energy who would be more enforceable. He felt a baseline survey should be done to be able to identify that open space or any encroachment. Ms. Burke said the Conservation Commission would hold the CR, not the homeowners Association. Mr. Driscoll indicated that his preference would be that the Wildlands Trust take the land, if they are willing to take it; if they also took the Bridgewater Preserve, it would be a great piece for them along the river. Ms. Burke agreed that the Wildlands Trust would be better suited to handle both those pieces of property. Mr. Driscoll commented that he thought the piece abutting the Jenny Leonard Park on the Auburn Street side would be taken by the town. He commented that if the Wildlands Trust takes it, it would be open to the public; if it were the Homeowners Association it would be private.

On a motion by Mr. Ajemian, seconded by Mr. MacDonald it was unanimously voted by roll call vote, to recommend that the Open Space go to the Wildlands Trust except for the piece that abuts Jenny Leonard Park.

On a motion by Mr. MacDonald, seconded by Mr. Geller, it was unanimously voted to release lot 27 in the Oldfield, II subdivision from the covenant.

On a motion by Ms. Guarino, seconded by Mr. Ajemian, it was unanimously voted by roll call vote, to adjourn the meeting at 9:27 pm.

MINUTES APPROVED: 4/21/21