

*Minutes subject to correction by the Essex Junction Planning Commission. Changes, if any, will be recorded in the Minutes of the next meeting of the Planning Commission.*

**VILLAGE OF ESSEX JUNCTION  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
April 17, 2008**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mark Thibeault (Chairman); Diane Clemens, Dan Kerin, Andrew Boutin, Liza Kilcoyne.

**ADMINISTRATION:** Jeff Arango, Developer Director.

---

**1. CALL TO ORDER and AUDIENCE FOR VISITORS**

Chairman Mark Thibeault called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

**2. ADDITIONS/AMENDMENTS TO AGENDA**

None.

**3. MINUTES**

*April 3, 2008*

**MOTION by Andrew Boutin, SECOND by Diane Clemens, to approve the 4/3/08 minutes as written. VOTING: 5 ayes; motion carried.**

**4. PUBLIC MEETING**

Mark Thibeault explained the procedure to be followed with applications before the Planning Commission and swore in those individuals to give testimony.

Site plan for a 1,021 s.f. accessory apartment within an unattached garage at 5 Maple Street Extension in the R-1 District by Richard Giard, agent for Scott Jeter and Nicole Giard-Jeter, owners

Richard Giard and Scott Jeter appeared on behalf of the application.

**STAFF REPORT**

Jeff Arango explained the proposal for a one-bedroom accessory apartment in a new unattached two-story structure with a garage. The apartment kitchen, dining room, and

living room will be on the first floor and the bedroom will be on the second floor. Per the Code, an apartment in an accessory structure built after the effective date of the code requires conditional use approval. The Zoning Board granted conditional use approval for the apartment. Total floor area of the existing single family house is 3,500 s.f. With the addition of the apartment the square footage is 4,521. The apartment will occupy 22.6% of the living space of the principal dwelling which meets the requirement of not exceeding 30%. The application complies with all setbacks and lot coverage in the R-1 District. The hip roof originally proposed has been changed to a gable roof with two dormers. There will be vinyl siding to match the existing house. Vermont Department of Public Safety fire codes must be met. Also, no more than two individuals can reside in the apartment and the principal dwelling must be owner occupied. There are three parking spaces as required. The applicant is requesting a waiver from paving the driveway to access the new structure. The existing driveway to the principal house is paved and the new driveway will come off of the paved driveway to the new structure. Gravel will not go into the roadway.

#### APPLICANT COMMENTS

The applicant did not add comment to the report by staff.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no comments from the public.

**MOTION by Diane Clemens, SECOND by Liza Kilcoyne, to close the public portion of the Giard/Jeter application for an accessory apartment at 5 Maple Street Extension. VOTING: 5 ayes; motion carried.**

#### DELIBERATION/DECISION

##### Site Plan, Accessory Apartment, 5 Maple Street Extension, Giard/Jeter

Mark Thibeault spoke against the waiver for paving because without clear definition of the driveway cars will park on green space. There was brief discussion of gravel versus paving. It was noted there is space to park two cars in the garage.

Liza Kilcoyne asked about a landscape requirement. Jeff Arango noted the regulations say the landscape must look like a single family home. A typical single family house has no landscaping requirements per the Land Development Code.

**MOTION by Dan Kerin, SECOND by Andrew Boutin, to approve the site plan for an accessory apartment at 5 Maple Street Extension by Richard Giard and Scott Jeter with the following conditions:**

- 1. The accessory apartment shall be limited to no more than two individuals and the principal dwelling shall be owner occupied.**

2. **There shall be no parking on green spaces.**
3. **The garage and apartment shall comply with the Vermont Fire Safety Prevention Code.**

**VOTING: 4 ayes, 1 nay (Thibeault); motion carried.**

Site plan for a daycare facility at 10 Cascade Street in the R-2 District by Pamela Richland, owner

Owen Jenkins and Pamela Richland appeared on behalf of the application. Andrew Boutin recused himself from the Planning Commission.

#### STAFF REPORT

Jeff Arango explained the proposal for a daycare at 10 Cascade Street in the R-2 District. Conditional use approval is required. The Zoning Board granted conditional use approval. There will be up to 10 children at the daycare, including two newborns (up to 18 months of age), four toddlers and/or preschoolers (10 months to three years or older), and four after school children. Hours of operation will be Monday through Friday, 7 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. Parents will drop off/pick up children in the driveway of 10 Cascade Street or park their car on Cascade Street and walk to the house. There is an existing in-ground pool that will be removed by July 31<sup>st</sup>. There can be outdoor play in the yard or across the street at the public park. The state permit that was granted stipulated the pool be removed by July, 2008, and that the play area in the yard is fenced. There is an existing four foot high chain link fence for the pool which will remain in place for the outdoor play area. There is 524.75 s.f. inside the house for indoor play space which is greater than the required 35 s.f. per client. There is 50 s.f. per child of outdoor space. The play area must not be closer than 25' to a public street. The outdoor play area meets this requirement. Regarding screening, the entire backyard is screened by cedar hedges of approximately 20' in height. There is a 40' section adjacent to the house to the north with a six foot high stockade fence. The adjacent house is a raised ranch and the grade of the bottom of the house is higher than the applicant's backyard so the neighbor has a clear sight line. A fence over 20' in height would have to be installed to screen the view. Regarding traffic, per the ITE Manual a daycare of this size will generate .82 AM peak hour trips per student and .85 PM peak hour trips per student for a total of 4.92 AM trips/client and 8.5 PM trips/client. Four students will arrive at the daycare after school (likely walking to the house). Traffic impact by the daycare is not significant. Regarding noise, the village has a noise ordinance allowing 70 dB constant (hourly average) and 80 dB spikes. The Zoning Board did not hear reliable testimony that the daycare will exceed the noise limits set forth in the ordinance. A daycare with up to six children is allowed without state or local oversight. A separate portion of the ordinance deals with nuisance noise between neighbors (loud stereos, cars, and such).

#### APPLICANT COMMENTS

Owen Jenkins, attorney representing the applicant, Pamela Richland, reported the state license was issued for the daycare facility on April 11, 2008, effective March 30, 2008. There are two conditions on the permit, one being that Ms. Richland attend a general orientation within 90 days, but can operate the daycare in the mean time. Ms. Richland has scheduled her orientation session already. Another condition of the permit is that the pool is filled in by July. The daycare can be operated prior to the pool being removed. Ms. Richland plans to fill in the pool in the coming weeks. Childcare facilities in the state are being given a higher priority, continued Mr. Jenkins, noting permitting is easier, especially at the local level because daycares are needed. Ms. Richland can operate a daycare with up to six children without a state permit. State law allows Ms. Richland to have unlimited family members and two other families with an unlimited number of children at her home without being regulated by the state. By applying for a state permit, Ms. Richland has capped the number children at ten and the daycare is subject to state and local review. The state will do annual inspections plus two unannounced visits to ensure compliance. The Zoning Board granted conditional use approval of the application with conditions and findings. The applicant is requesting the same conditions of approval from the Planning Commission. The property is in the R-2 District, not the R-1 District as noted in the Staff Report. The R-2 District allows high density, single family dwellings and accessory uses. There is an existing chain link fence that is 48" high on the property. The fence was installed when the pool was installed. The fenced area will become the play area in the backyard once the pool is removed.

Mark Thibeault asked if the process for state licensing of a daycare requires the yard to be fenced. Mr. Jenkins confirmed this. Mr. Thibeault asked if the state permit caps the total number of children at the Richland facility to ten. Mr. Jenkins confirmed this. Liza Kilcoyne asked about staff members. Mr. Jenkins stated Pamela Richland will be the only staff member. The state does not require more staff until the number of children exceeds ten. There was continued discussion of the number of staff. Pamela Richland stated Childcare Resources and the State of Vermont did not include the Richland children in the number for the daycare. Ms. Richland has three children still living at home (age 9, 10, and 13 years old).

Photos taken from 47 Greenwood Ave. (Kerner property) overlooking the Richland backyard were reviewed in terms of screening and topography. There is a 40' strip of open space in the screening between the Kerner and Richland yards. There is a stockade fence on the Kerner property. It was noted a fence 20' high would be needed to fully screen the view of the Richland backyard from the Kerner property. Mark Thibeault asked about additional screening. Mr. Jenkins stated additional screening would be an unnecessary burden on the applicant since the neighbor (Kerner) created the situation themselves with the addition to their house. There will be no changes to the Richland property except removal of the pool. Some play equipment may be added to the play area at some point in time. There is a public park across the street from the Richland house which will be used by the daycare. Mark Thibeault asked if the amount of time outside is a requirement of the state license. Mr. Jenkins explained there is not a specified amount of outside time, just that there be outside play time. There are 26 licensed daycare facilities in the village and town with about a dozen in the village alone. Two are located

in nearby neighborhoods, one at 9 South Street Lane and one at 13 South Hill Drive so the proposed facility is not out of character with the area. Regarding noise, Mr. Jenkins stated the noise ordinance is more directed at activities occurring at the fairgrounds. Unless there is evidence that the proposed use will exceed the noise levels in the ordinance then the issue is enforcement if 70 dB is exceeded constantly. Normal face-to-face conversation is 60 dB. A lawnmower is 80 dB. The farther from the source of the noise the lower the decibels. Jeff Arango commented someone mowing their lawn would likely have a technical violation of the ordinance. Owen Jenkins stated the pool in the Richland backyard has been there for years and there has been noise from the pump and people using the pool. The noise situation will likely improve with the proposed use.

Dan Kerin expressed concern about traffic on the street, especially with the park and ball fields in the summer. There are snow banks in the winter that hinder sight distance. The intersection of Cascade Street and Cascade Court is difficult to negotiate at times. There is concern about cars backing out of the applicant's driveway and obstructed views. Pam Richland stated there is space for four cars on her property (two in the garage and two in the driveway). There will be a snow removal plan in place. Hours of operation were set for convenience purposes, but it is not certain all children will arrive at 7 a.m. The after school children will likely walk to the house. Parents can drop off/pick up children while parked in the driveway. Jeff Arango noted parking is allowed on the street except there is no over night parking from November to April. The street is over 20' wide and can accommodate two passing cars as well as parking. Mark Thibeault observed the applicant has the ability to control the drop off/pick up of children at her house. Having parents and children cross the street (i.e. park across the street) is not workable.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

Al Kerner, 47 Greenwood Avenue (resident there for over 19 years), read a statement of concerns, including the physical footprint of 10 Cascade Street and 47 Greenwood Avenue which are corner lots with small, abutting backyards. There is no buffer between the yards and the three season porch on the Kerner house. The daycare is a de facto extension of the Kerner house and will have a negative impact on aesthetics, quality of life, and property value. Another concern is noise, continued Mr. Kerner, which based on past experience, has been an issue with Ms. Richland. There is concern about out of control noise from the proposal and the impact on the quality of life of the neighborhood. There has been an on-going noise problem at 10 Cascade Street with screaming and yelling from early morning (7 a.m.) through night time (9 p.m.). Lack of consideration of neighbors by Ms. Richland is another issue, and this will get worse with the daycare. The lack of consideration is manifested by the appearance of the property, cutting the cedar hedge owned by the Kerners without permission, and the lack of prior communication about the proposal to the neighbors.

Denise Kerner, 47 Greenwood Ave., stated their house is the same level as a raised ranch. The house was not raised above a raised ranch level with the room addition. Regarding statements by Mr. Jenkins about the state expediting daycare licensing, it seems strange the state would allow operation of the daycare facility before there is a fenced play yard

and the pool is removed. Other areas of concern based on past experiences are noise, vandalism (Ms. Richland's child cut the cedar hedge without permission), children running through flower gardens, and screaming, yelling, and impact on quality of life.

Melissa Cantrell, 45 Greenwood Avenue, said she is a mother of two children and a registered nurse who chose to work the night shift. Adjustments were made with her own children with regard to noise. Ms. Cantrell echoed the statements already made about noise from the Richland property, recalling an incident where police were contacted due to noise after 10 p.m. at the Richland residence. Ms. Richland was yelling at her children and her children were yelling back at her. The police suggested the neighbors speak with Ms. Richland and if there is no change in the situation then the police will further investigate. Ms. Cantrell said she spoke to Ms. Richland about the noise not being acceptable and the matter was resolved for a while, but as of late the situation has escalated. Ms. Cantrell testified she must sleep during the day and make adjustments to do so. If there are too many odds against being able to sleep during the day, there is concern about making mistakes at work which could jeopardize her job. Ms. Cantrell said she is a mandatory reporter and one individual caring for 10 children seems unreasonable. If something happens to the caregiver, the children will be unattended. Ms. Cantrell questioned what action she should take if she hears crying that does not stop. Ms. Cantrell implored the Planning Commission to hear her, adding she will have to be consistently following up on Ms. Richland's daycare to ensure the legal obligations of the permit are satisfied. Ms. Cantrell testified the rule on the hospital floor as a pediatric nurse was one nurse cannot work the floor with over three children (patients). Ms. Cantrell stated she and her husband work three jobs to make ends meet and understand Ms. Richland is injured and cannot return to her employment outside of the house, but a part-time worker should be allowed and Ms. Richland should rent a facility in the commercial district for the daycare. There is concern for the children in the daycare and that parents will not know there is problem until it is too late. Mark Thibeault clarified site plan review before the Planning Commission is based on the license granted by the State of Vermont. The Planning Commission has no ability to require additional staff. Ms. Richland stated her family has the upstairs space. The downstairs bedrooms and bathroom will be used by the children at daycare. Ms. Richland reviewed the daily schedule as follows:

7 a.m. – 8 a.m.	Drop Off/Free Play
8 a.m. – 8:30 a.m.	Snack (food program with the state)
9 a.m. – 9:15 a.m.	Circle Time/Show-and-Tell
9:15 a.m. – 9:45 a.m.	Project Time/Infant Care
9:45 a.m. – 10 a.m.	Learning Time
10 a.m. – 11 a.m.	Outside Play in Backyard/Newborn Naps
11 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.	Lunch
11:30 a.m. – 11:45 a.m.	Songs/Poems
11:45 a.m. – Noon	Story Time
Noon – 1 p.m.	Outside/Free Play (possibly at public park)
1 p.m. – 3 p.m.	Nap Time
3 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.	Snack Time

3:30 p.m. – 4 p.m.	Free Play
4 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.	Free Time
4:30 p.m. -5:30 p.m.	Indoor/Outdoor Free Play
5:30 p.m.	Pick Up

Denise Kerner commented with potentially 15 children in the house there is no schedule. Ms. Richland testified the dynamics are different in her house now that her two oldest children have moved out. It would be appreciated to have the opportunity to operate the daycare. Regarding the “vandalism” referred to by the Kerners, Ms. Richland said her son did not know the shrubs were the Kerners and apologized after cutting them. Money was offered to repair the damage, but the Kerners declined the offer. Melissa Cantrell stated she heard two of the Richland children still living in the house screaming for years and heard Ms. Richland screaming at the children. Ms. Cantrell said she was not even aware there were older children in the household. Mark Thibeault asked if most of the noise is associated with summer and use of the pool. Ms. Cantrell opined the Planning Commission seems not to be hearing the neighbors stating concerns about children in the street, safety issues with a daycare in the Richland house. Ms. Cantrell pointed out as a mandatory reporter she does not see a safety net where to report problems. Mark Thibeault advised any problems can be reported as a citizen to the police or if there is a permit violation to the Zoning Administrator, Jeff Arango, or to the state (Child Development Division who issued the permit). There was discussion of the role of the Planning Commission with a state approved facility. Jeff Arango explained the Village Planning Commission’s jurisdiction includes items such as buffering, screening, fencing, indoor/outdoor play space, parking and traffic relative to safety impacts. A decision by the Planning Commission can be appealed to the courts. Owen Jenkins reiterated the application is about the proposed use, not past issues of noise from the property. Site plan review looks at the physical layout. Section 717.C specifies standards for a daycare. Ms. Richland has inside and outside play areas that exceed the requirements. The daycare is on the first floor of her house. Regarding the property and use in the Kerner’s backyard, the Kerner’s three season porch is not on the property line. It is assumed the structure meets the setbacks and the proper permits were secured. No technical evidence has been presented indicating the proposed daycare will present a problem, and there is an avenue for enforcement if there are problems. Mr. Jenkins corrected that he did not say the state is expediting permits, but that the state has clarified the requirements and is encouraging daycare facilities under conditions because the facilities are needed. The facilities are regulated. The state is not railroading facilities through the system. Safety is addressed. Ms. Richland is also a mandatory reporter. An appeal of a decision by the Planning Commission or the state can be filed. Ms. Richland could decrease the number of children in the daycare to six and operate without any regulation. Ms. Cantrell announced she will be appealing the decision by the Planning Commission.

There were no further comments.

**MOTION by Dan Kerin, SECOND by Liza Kilcoyne, to close the public portion of the application for a daycare at 10 Cascade Street by Pamela Richland. VOTING: 4 ayes; motion carried.**

## DELIBERATION/DECISION

### Site Plan, Daycare Facility, 10 Cascade Street, Richland

There was discussion of the noise complaints. Jeff Arango explained it is difficult to determine the source of noise in a residential area with children playing outside. Dan Kerin expressed concern about parking and flow of traffic in the area. Jeff Arango noted the park is used every summer by Little League. Liza Kilcoyne pointed out daycare centers are embedded in neighborhoods and this is nice way to care for children. The Planning Commission has no jurisdiction over the operation. The state allows 10 children to one caregiver. The state will monitor the facility. Mark Thibeault asked if there was any evidence put forth that can be relied on indicating adverse impacts based on noise from the use. Liza Kilcoyne likened the situation to living next to a school and recess time (i.e. neighbors can always tell when it is recess time at the school due to associated noise from the children). Diane Clemens stated there was nothing presented indicating noise from the daycare will impact life any more than what existed prior to the daycare. In fact, the proposal may produce less noise.

**MOTION by Mark Thibeault, SECOND by Diane Clemens, to approve the site plan by Pamela Richland for a daycare facility at 10 Cascade Street with the following conditions:**

- 1. In order to operate the facility prior to the swimming pool being removed the applicant shall use the park for outdoor activities.**
- 2. There may be up to two staff members.**
- 3. All standards of the village noise ordinance shall be met.**
- 4. There shall be up to 10 children at the daycare (six full time clients and four part time clients where “part time” is defined as children who come after school).**
- 5. The applicant shall maintain a license with the State of Vermont and meet all requirements therewith.**
- 6. All drop-off/pick-up of children shall occur in the driveway.**

**VOTING: 4 ayes; motion carried.**

Andrew Boutin returned to the Planning Commission.

Site plan for a major amendment to reconfigure the access driveway, parking, waterproofing, and drainage improvements to the Park Street School, 21 Park Street in the Village Center District by Michael Burke, agent for the Essex Junction School District, owner

Mike Burke, Bruce Murdough, and John Alden appeared on behalf of the application.

STAFF REPORT



Jeff Arango explained the request for a new paved parking lot, drainage improvements, and lighting at the Park Street School at 21 Park Street. There will be a walkway from Park Street to the school building. The applicant submitted revised plans which address comments from the Village Engineer. There will be 20 parking spaces in the lot by the school and lighting improvements in the walkway. The lower portion of the lot will be paved as an alternative. There will be a horizontal separation of the walkway and the grass strip. There will be lights by the walkway and the entrance drive. The applicant is requesting a waiver to the 20% shading requirement in the parking lot. There are large deciduous trees on the southern boundary that provide shade in summer. A waiver is also requested for landscaping. The southern portion of the property is grass and trees. There is additional landscaping by Park Street. Regarding access to abutting properties, the only access for the Hinsdale property (Dominos, bread outlet) is through the school property. Ming's property would benefit by having an additional access. There have been informal discussions with the school district about utilizing the open space on the property for some form of public park.

#### APPLICANT COMMENTS

John Alden reviewed the refurbishing plans for the Park Street School building (windows, brickwork, wood trim, roof repair). There will be no exterior changes except for the accessible entry ramp from the accessible parking space. A new elevator will be installed inside the building. The lower floor of the building will be meeting space (training sessions for teachers and such). The use will be less of a school nature and more of meeting space. Up to 80 people can be in the space per the fire code, but it is not likely there will be that number. There are four rooms. The Fire Marshall will allow up to 160 people in the building. There are classrooms upstairs. The building is an historic structure (over 100 years old) and a key part of the educational fabric in the community. The challenge is how to use the building and keep it as part of the school system. The view of the building from Park Street is open green space. The school district supports continuing the open space and promoting the view corridor from Park Street. The portion of the building facing Park Street is being restored. No work is being done on the portion of the building facing School Street. There will be an emergency access only out of the building to School Street. Residents on School Street do not want parking on the street. Grass will be planted on the School Street side of the school by the building.

There was discussion of parking for a large meeting. The applicant noted other school facilities can be used if large spaces are needed. There is also public parking in the area of the Park Street School.

John Alden explained the concrete ramp entrance to the building for accessibility. The ramp falls under design review by the Planning Commission. The railings will blend with the building.

There was discussion of landscaping and tree plantings. The school district will trim trees by the building, but there is no intention to plant trees along the property line. There are no trees there now. The historic aspect of the view of the building will not be changed

(open corridor). Benches are not planned by the building. Liza Kilcoyne suggested planting on the perimeter of the parking lot will frame the view of the building. Bruce Murdough stated the dead trees that are there now will be removed. John Alden pointed out in order to shade the parking lot trees would have to be planted on the south side of the lot and this will impact the view of the building from Park Street. There are existing trees along the railroad tracks that are very large. Bruce Murdough interjected if the Planning Commission wants trees then the school district will plant trees. Diane Clemens suggested some additional trees on the north side to replace the dead trees being removed. The trees will help cool the parking lot as well and allow some green to offset all the paving.

There was mention of lighting. The lights will be the shoebox style which is used at all the schools in the village. It was noted as part of the Five Corners project, the Village is installing antique style streetlamps along Park Street. Continuing this type of lighting on the school walkway would complement the project. There was discussion of cost and possibly finding grant money for the seven or eight lights that would be needed on the school walkway. There is interest in having a small public park area on the lower portion of the school property by Park Street.

Bruce Murdough mentioned paving the lot and the interest in phasing the project due to cost (solicit two bids, one for the top portion and one for the lower portion). The school district would like to start paving in June and complete the work by August. Within a year the entire lot will be paved. The property owners abutting the lower portion of the property (Ming's and Hinsdale) are in discussion with the school board about access. Dan Kerin asked about the concrete curbing on the north side of the driveway. Mike Burke explained the curbing directs storm water run off to a grass lined swale and then into the municipal storm drain. The amount of impervious surface is not being increased.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

Rebecca Lemire spoke on behalf of the Hinsdale commercial property to the north of Park Street School (Domino's, bread outlet) and expressed interest in continuing access to the back of the Hinsdale building. Employees at the businesses in the building park their cars behind the building so the spaces in front are open for customers. There are also dumpsters behind the building. The building has been owned by the Hinsdales since 1954 with access behind the building through the school property. Bruce Murdough confirmed the school district received letters from Hinsdale, Ming's, and Essex Paint and Carpet about access/parking on the property. The school board will decide the issue. It is anticipated there will be an amicable resolution. Ms. Lemire said any additional expense associated with allowing the access for the Hinsdale property will be covered.

Owner of the Ming's property also stated his interest in access to the back lot in the form of an easement.

John Wagner, Essex Paint and Carpet (27 Park Street) confirmed he is seeking to negotiate with the school board about parking and access. Essex Paint and Carpet has

been in the building at 27 Park Street for the past nine years. There are three retail businesses in the building and the businesses continue to grow. Employees have been informally parking on school property to leave spaces by the stores open for customers. Mr. Wagner reiterated he seeks to negotiate with the school board for municipal parking in the area where parking now informally exists. Mark Thibeault explained if the Planning Commission approves the site plan as submitted (i.e. with a specific parking allotment) and that changes based on negotiations with adjacent property owners, then the site plan must be amended or the applicant will not be in compliance. Mr. Thibeault spoke in support of incorporating parking and public park space into the plan. Bruce Murdough clarified the school district would like approval for the upper portion of the parking lot which will provide enough parking for what the school will do in the building. Liza Kilcoyne agreed phasing is a good idea. There will be additional public parking on Park Street as a result of the Five Corners project.

There were no further comments.

**MOTION by Dan Kerin, SECOND by Liza Kilcoyne, to close the public portion of the site plan amendment for Park Street School by the Essex Junction School District. VOTING: 5 ayes; motion carried.**

#### DELIBERATION/DECISION

##### Site Plan Amendment, Improvements to Park Street School, 21 Park Street, Essex Junction School District

Liza Kilcoyne spoke in support of installing the historically correct light fixtures in the municipal lot to fit with the lighting in the village district. Ms. Kilcoyne suggested the neighbors interested in access through the school property could donate funds for the lighting. Regarding landscaping, Ms. Kilcoyne did not support granting a waiver for the shade trees. Street trees should be planted along the driveway. There was discussion of different tree species/types, existing trees, and the 20% shading requirement. Ms. Kilcoyne suggested the applicant submit a landscape plan that meets the requirements of the Land Development Code. A sign, landscaping, and a bench by the entrance to the property on Park Street would be very appealing. There are two issues: shading the parking lot and the street entrance.

**MOTION by Dan Kerin, SECOND by Andrew Boutin, to table the application for 21 Park Street (Park Street School) pending further information on the following:**

- **Landscape plan (including shading the parking lot and the Park Street entryway)**
- **Upgrade of lighting with historic looking lights**
- **Phasing of the paving**

**VOTING: 5 ayes; motion carried.**

**5. OTHER PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS**

Information on Historic Sites and Preservation

The Planning Commission received a map of historic sites listed on the state and national register, and a memo from Jeff Arango, dated 4/17/08, on historic preservation.

Best Wishes to Jeff Arango

Good luck and best wishes were extended to Jeff Arango in his move to Seattle, Washington.

**6. ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION by Dan Kerin, SECOND by Andrew Boutin, to adjourn the meeting.**

**VOTING: 5 ayes; motion carried.**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

*RScty: M.E.Riordan*