

1/9

William Clark

From: connellyconstruction@verizon.net
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2012 2:53 PM
To: William Clark
Cc: ekimilton@gmail.com; Kevin Mearn

Bill,
We need a continuance for the public hearing scheduled for April 12th regarding 131 Eliot St. Our architect is unable to attend to present our completed application.

Regards, Steven C.

2/9

William Clark

From: Emily Innes <ekimilton@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2012 10:10 PM
To: William Clark
Subject: 131 Eliot Street 1 of 5

Part I of V for Thursday's packages.

From: connellyconstruction@verizon.net [mailto:connellyconstruction@verizon.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2012 1:41 PM
To: ekimilton@gmail.com
Cc: alex.whiteside@hotmail.com; b.lynch@inspecthouse.com; kmearn@townofmilton.org
Subject:

Hi Emily,

Since Tuesday evening, I have been told by three Milton residents that Peter Jackson is going to make a motion at the Planning Board meeting on April 12th, 2012. The motion is going to move to deny our special permit application for 131 Eliot St. Although it is hearsay, it has caused a substantial amount of concernment for us as applicants. I would like to have confirmation from the Planning Board members that they would not consider a denial motion for our application from Mr Jackson.

Regards, Steven Connelly

3/9

William Clark

From: Emily Innes <ekimilton@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2012 10:10 PM
To: William Clark
Subject: 131 Eliot Street 2 of 5

Part II of V for Thursday's packages.

From: Emily Innes [<mailto:ekimilton@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2012 10:38 PM
To: 'connellyconstruction@verizon.net'
Cc: 'alex.whiteside@hotmail.com'; 'b.lynch@inspecthouse.com'; 'kmearn@townofmilton.org'
Subject: RE:

Gentlemen,

I apologize for the tardy response – I just got home from work.

Steve, your email was addressed to three members of the Planning Board. The confirmation you request would be in violation of the Open Meeting Law.

This, in turn would place your application in jeopardy.

Alex and Bernie, I know you are already aware of this legal requirement.

Steve, I will respond to your email in the morning. Please address any future communication regarding Planning Board process to me only.

Thank you.

Emily

From: connellyconstruction@verizon.net [<mailto:connellyconstruction@verizon.net>]
Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2012 1:41 PM
To: ekimilton@gmail.com
Cc: alex.whiteside@hotmail.com; b.lynch@inspecthouse.com; kmearn@townofmilton.org
Subject:

Hi Emily,

Since Tuesday evening, I have been told by three Milton residents that Peter Jackson is going to make a motion at the Planning Board meeting on April 12th, 2012. The motion is going to move to deny our special permit application for 131 Eliot St. Although it is hearsay, it has caused a substantial amount of concernment for us as applicants. I would like to have confirmation from the Planning Board members that they would not consider a denial motion for our application from Mr Jackson.

Regards, Steven Connelly

4/9

William Clark

From: Emily Innes <ekimilton@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2012 10:10 PM
To: William Clark
Subject: 131 Eliot Street 3 of 5

Part III of V for Thursday's packages

From: Emily Innes [<mailto:ekimilton@gmail.com>]
Sent: Friday, March 09, 2012 7:17 AM
To: 'connellyconstruction@verizon.net'
Subject: RE:

Steve,

I have not heard these rumors. Nor has Peter Jackson or any other member of the Board indicated an intention to make such a motion to me.

Procedurally, a motion made and seconded must be considered and discussed, as long as the motion is in proper form.

We can discuss the format of the meeting as we get closer, although, as you know, we did not finish working our way through the Zoning Matrix, so that will be part of it.

My question to you is whether you will be addressing the substance of last week's meeting on April 12. We have identified several questions related to the zoning, and the public has raised their own concerns. As you know, in addition to the zoning provisions, which must be met as a minimum requirement of granting a Special Permit, we must also consider the public welfare.

The substance of your response to the questions that were raised will, in large part, determine the tone and flow of the April meeting. I will continue to make the process as smooth and as fair to all parties as possible.

As I said in my earlier email, please do not email other members of the Board with requests for substantive discussions.

Emily

From: connellyconstruction@verizon.net [<mailto:connellyconstruction@verizon.net>]
Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2012 1:41 PM
To: ekimilton@gmail.com
Cc: alex.whiteside@hotmail.com; b.lynych@inspecthouse.com; kmearn@townofmilton.org
Subject:

Hi Emily,

Since Tuesday evening, I have been told by three Milton residents that Peter Jackson is going to make a motion at the Planning Board meeting on April 12th, 2012. The motion is going to move to deny our special permit application for 131 Eliot St. Although it is hearsay, it has caused a substantial amount of concernment for us as applicants. I would like to have confirmation from the Planning Board members that they would not consider a denial motion for our application from Mr Jackson.

Regards, Steven Connelly

5/9
William Clark

From: Emily Innes <ekimilton@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2012 10:10 PM
To: William Clark
Subject: 131 Eliot Street 4 of 5

Part IV of V for Thursday's packages.

From: connellyconstruction@verizon.net [mailto:connellyconstruction@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2012 4:49 PM
To: ekimilton@gmail.com
Cc: alex.whiteside@hotmail.com; b.lynch@inspecthouse.com; kmearn@townofmilton.org
Subject: Re: RE:131 Eliot St.

Emily,

This application process has been anything but fair to us as applicants. Your response to my question reveals what is wrong with this approval process. Meeting the zoning provisions is not the minimum requirement for a special permit. It is the major requirement for the issuance of a special permit. The bylaw reflects what the planning board sponsored at three different Town Meetings in 2006 and 2007. It is what the representatives of our town expect for the buildout of the site. Currently, the Planning Board meetings are non-productive due to three members of the public: Ellen Denooyer, Cheryl Tougias, and Peter Mullin. Peter Mullin has accused my team of impropriety regarding the data in our traffic study. He made the accusation because he clearly did not understand the data in the report. Ms. Denooyer and Ms. Tougias have made baseless and irresponsible representations of what could be developed on the site without a shread of analysis and data to back it up. Both Ms. Denooyer and Ms. Tougias have stated that they are friends of Planning Board member Mr. Jackson. Mr. Jackson has stated on the record that he is against this application and he has been asked on numerous occasions to recuse himself from the public hearing because of a conflict of interest issue he has with this application. These three individuals are not acting in the best interest of the town, they are acting in the best interest of Mr. Jackson, in my opinion. My hope is that the Planning Board adheres to what the residents of our town want rather than embracing the obstructionist view of a few people at the expense of our community.

Regards, Steve

C.

Mar 9, 2012 06:17:24 AM, ekimilton@gmail.com wrote:

Steve,

I have not heard these rumors. Nor has Peter Jackson or any other member of the Board indicated an intention to make such a motion to me.

Procedurally, a motion made and seconded must be considered and discussed, as long as the motion is in proper form.

6/9

We can discuss the format of the meeting as we get closer, although, as you know, we did not finish working our way through the Zoning Matrix, so that will be part of it.

My question to you is whether you will be addressing the substance of last week's meeting on April 12. We have identified several questions related to the zoning, and the public has raised their own concerns. As you know, in addition to the zoning provisions, which must be met as a minimum requirement of granting a Special Permit, we must also consider the public welfare.

The substance of your response to the questions that were raised will, in large part, determine the tone and flow of the April meeting. I will continue to make the process as smooth and as fair to all parties as possible.

As I said in my earlier email, please do not email other members of the Board with requests for substantive discussions.

Emily

From: connellyconstruction@verizon.net [mailto:connellyconstruction@verizon.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2012 1:41 PM
To: ekimilton@gmail.com
Cc: alex.whiteside@hotmail.com; b.lynch@inspecthouse.com; kmearn@townofmilton.org
Subject:

Hi Emily,

Since Tuesday evening, I have been told by three Milton residents that Peter Jackson is going to make a motion at the Planning Board meeting on April 12th, 2012. The motion is going to move to deny our special permit application for 131 Eliot St. Although it is hearsay, it has caused a substantial amount of concernment for us as applicants. I would like to have confirmation from the Planning Board members that they would not consider a denial motion for our application from Mr Jackson.

Regards, Steven Connelly

7/9

William Clark

From: Emily Innes <ekimilton@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2012 10:10 PM
To: William Clark
Subject: 131 Eliot Street 5 of 5

Part V of V for Thursday's packages

From: Emily Innes [mailto:ekimilton@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2012 5:04 PM
To: connellyconstruction@verizon.net
Subject: Re: RE:131 Eliot St.

Steve,

I cannot respond to any emails that you copy to other members of the Planning Board. Please correspond with me only.

Emily

On Mar 12, 2012 4:48 PM, <connellyconstruction@verizon.net> wrote:

Emily,
This application process has been anything but fair to us as applicants. Your response to my question reveals what is wrong with this approval process. Meeting the zoning provisions is not the minimum requirement for a special permit. It is the major requirement for the issuance of a special permit. The bylaw reflects what the planning board sponsored at three different Town Meetings in 2006 and 2007. It is what the representatives of our town expect for the buildout of the site. Currently, the Planning Board meetings are non-productive due to three members of the public: Ellen Denooyer, Cheryl Tougias, and Peter Mullin. Peter Mullin has accused my team of impropriety regarding the data in our traffic study. He made the accusation because he clearly did not understand the data in the report. Ms. Denooyer and Ms. Tougias have made baseless and irresponsible representations of what could be developed on the site without a shred of analysis and data to back it up. Both Ms. Denooyer and Ms. Tougias have stated that they are friends of Planning Board member Mr. Jackson. Mr. Jackson has stated on the record that he is against this application and he has been asked on numerous occasions to recuse himself from the public hearing because of a conflict of interest issue he has with this application. These three individuals are not acting in the best interest of the town, they are acting in the best interest of Mr. Jackson, in my opinion. My hope is that the Planning Board adheres to what the residents of our town want rather than embracing the obstructionist view of a few people at the expense of our community.

Regards, Steve

C.

Mar 9, 2012 06:17:24 AM, ekimilton@gmail.com wrote:

Steve,

I have not heard these rumors. Nor has Peter Jackson or any other member of the Board indicated an intention to make such a motion to me. 8/9

Procedurally, a motion made and seconded must be considered and discussed, as long as the motion is in proper form.

We can discuss the format of the meeting as we get closer, although, as you know, we did not finish working our way through the Zoning Matrix, so that will be part of it.

My question to you is whether you will be addressing the substance of last week's meeting on April 12. We have identified several questions related to the zoning, and the public has raised their own concerns. As you know, in addition to the zoning provisions, which must be met as a minimum requirement of granting a Special Permit, we must also consider the public welfare.

The substance of your response to the questions that were raised will, in large part, determine the tone and flow of the April meeting. I will continue to make the process as smooth and as fair to all parties as possible.

As I said in my earlier email, please do not email other members of the Board with requests for substantive discussions.

Emily

From: connellyconstruction@verizon.net [mailto:connellyconstruction@verizon.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2012 1:41 PM
To: ekimilton@gmail.com
Cc: alex.whiteside@hotmail.com; b.lynch@inspecthouse.com; kmearn@townofmilton.org
Subject:

Hi Emily,

Since Tuesday evening, I have been told by three Milton residents that Peter Jackson is going to make a motion at the Planning Board meeting on April 12th, 2012. The motion is going to move to deny our special permit application for 131 Eliot St. Although it is hearsay, it has

9/9

caused a substantial amount of concernment for us as applicants. I would like to have confirmation from the Planning Board members that they would not consider a denial motion for our application from Mr Jackson.

Regards, Steven Connelly

Emily Innes

From: connellyconstruction@verizon.net
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2012 8:35 AM
To: ekimilton@gmail.com
Subject: Fwd: RE: 11/28/11

Emily,

I am stunned to see the alleged "massing study and site analysis" from Ms. Denooyer on the town website as a submitted document. This is not her property and she no authorization from us ,as applicants, to submit any document on our development.

You refuse to post my completed application filed with The Planning board in Sept.,2010 and then post this garbage from Ms.Denooyer.Call me Emily,we have a lot to discuss.You sat in on meetings with Alex Whiteside, Kevin Mearn, Jerry Connelly, and me and we made all the changes to the proposal you and Alex suggested.The changes were embraced by Ed Duffy and Bernie Lynch.What happened?

Feb 29, 2012 08:52:24 AM, wclark@townofmilton.org wrote:

Steve,

You sent me one email on the 27th.

I was not in the office Friday (24th) or Monday(27th) so I had no opportunity to respond in any manner on those days.

I discussed your request with Emily, last night, and we remain of the opinion that **all** plans you have submitted are on this webpage.

The issue of a complete application is still pending since I still do not have a complete SITE PLAN.

What you have filed for is a Special Permit & Site Plan Approval.

On a new subject the Conservation Commission has asked to meet with the Planning Board in joint session, March 1st. The meet purpose is to voice the Commission's process and add their comments before the Special Permit is given and something the Planning Board does contradicts the Conservation Commission findings.

Bill Clark