
Paperwork for modification

1 message

Michael <michael.weishan@southboroughhistory.org> Wed, May 6, 2026 at 8:00 AM
To: "Karina G. Quinn" <kquinn@southboroughma.com>
Cc: Board of Selectmen <bos@southboroughma.com>, Jon Delli Priscoli <JonDelli@firstcolonydev.com>, Amy Rosenberg <amythesoxfan@gmail.com>, Rebecca Deans-Rowe <rdeansrowe@gmail.com>, Meme Luttrell <mluttrell@southboroughma.com>, Beth Melo <mysouthborough@gmail.com>, Mark Robidoux <mrobidoux@southboroughma.gov>, Eric Reustle <ereustle@harringtonheep.com>

Hello Karina,

Please send me any forms required for the site plan modification. We intend to submit a draft filing before the end of the week, which should help avoid unnecessary time and effort, and provide clarity to the incoming Board and Southborough ratepayers regarding our intentions, as well as the past actions taken by certain members of the Planning Board.

Much of the discussion in prior meetings has been spent debating provisions that are clearly not permissible under the Dover Amendment and which we will be seeking to modify. This is a total waste of our time, our charitable dollars, and taxpayer money. The Planning Board has already waived bonding authority and must now comply with Dover requirements, which will substantially affect the applicable filing standards for this type of review. At this stage, the Board no longer has jurisdiction over our temporary occupancy. Town counsel has already warned the Board—twice—that informal or newly created policies are not legally binding.

Please be advised that a copy of this email has also been submitted as an op-ed to local news outlets, addressing Chair Luttrell's repeated assertion that we "should have appealed the site plan modification long ago." This is a callous and dismissive position that ignores the reality that such an appeal would have imposed a \$25,000–\$50,000 burden on a small charitable organization like ours—only to ultimately confirm what is already clear: **the Planning Board had limited jurisdiction over our Dover-protected property and vastly and knowingly overstepped its authority.**

Nor does Luttrell's rote position address the central issue: why certain members of the Planning Board would doggedly continue to pursue conditions they now know to be unlawful simply because a procedural loophole allows them to do so.

My answer is simple—personal spite.

At this rate, the Southborough Historical Society could have opened a medical marijuana facility in less time than it has taken us to open a history and arts center at Fayville Hall, thanks in large part to our Planning Board.

Given the pattern of discriminatory conduct by the current chair and member Braccio over the past several years, we believe it is appropriate to remove this matter from the May 11 agenda entirely and defer further Planning Board involvement in our occupancy permit until the full modification is filed and a new Board is in place. We feel confident that once this modification is filed, minor differences will be resolved forthwith.

Everyone in Southborough—seemingly minus two members, one outgoing, of the Planning Board—want a new community center for arts and culture.

A three-month extension of the occupancy permit—already requested twice—is standard practice. This would also align with current Planning Board treatment of other outstanding temporary occupancy permits, which do not include the types of conditions or enforcement measures that have been selectively applied to our organization.

Thank you,

Michael Weishan

President and CEO

Southborough History and Art Center

Michael
michael.weishan@southboroughhistory.org