

BEDFORD PLANNING BOARD
Town Hall Multipurpose Room
Minutes
August 3, 2016

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jeffrey Cohen, Chair; Sandra Hackman; Shawn Hanegan; Amy Lloyd; Lisa Mustapich, Clerk

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Catherine Perry, Assistant Planner; Kim Siebert, Recording Secretary.

OTHERS PRESENT: Barbara Albaro, 556 Springs Rd; Joe Albaro, 556 Springs Rd; Robert Annese, 2 Shire Lane (attorney for 5 abutters/neighbors); Scott Bailey, 10 High St ; Dot Bergin, 39 Hayden Lane/reporter, The Bedford Citizen; David Bernstein, 21 Alaska Ave (project developer); Aaron Bourret, 3 Glen Ora Dr ; Joan Bowen, 11 Fox Run Rd ; Carolyn Carbone, 38 Buehler Rd ; Ranjana Chheda, 34 Buehler Rd; Richard Cuti, 28 Buehler Rd ; Sue Cuti, 28 Buehler Rd ; Brian Devellis, 41 North Rd, DeVellis Consulting; Frank DiPetro, 803 Summer St, Boston, BSC Group; Jean Doherty, 36 Buehler Rd; Shawn Doherty, 36 Buehler Rd ; Rosemary Dyer, 4 Fox Run Rd ; Katherine Eskandarian, 4 Dewey Rd ; Mitch Evans, 7 Buehler Rd; Steven Evans, 7 Buehler Rd; Susan Goodman, 1 Copeland Dr; Kay Hamilton, 70C Great Road/ ZBA; Thomas Hirsch, 24 Fox Run Rd; Ira Holtzman, 32 Fox Run Rd; Margot Holtzman, 32 Fox Run Rd; Aubrey Jaffer, 33 Buehler Rd; Helen Kalantari, 8 Donovan Dr; Brenda Kelly, 25 Fox Run Rd; Frederick Klatt, 30 Fox Run Rd; Arnold Kovall, 18 Fox Run Rd; Annalisa Madison, 29 Fox Run Rd; Richard Madison, 29 Fox Run Rd; Alex Michalopoulos, 9 Dewey Rd; Joan Mikel, 20 Fox Run Rd; Kenneth Mikel, 20 Fox Run Rd; Karen Moore, 10 Copeland Dr; Teri Morrow, 548 Springs Rd; Alan Nelson, 25 Fox Run Rd; Marissa Nesbitt, 803 Summer St, Boston/BSC Group; David Powell, Finance Committee; Derek Peplau, 37 Buehler Rd; Susan Roos, 30 Buehler Rd; Keenan Ross, 2 Fox Run Rd; Mark Siegenthaler, Selectmen; Lawrence Ting, 3 Glen Ora Dr; Julie Turner, The Bedford Citizen; Donald Thompson, 32 Buehler Rd; Jeff Venuti, 1 Fox Run Rd; Annemarie Weicker, 27 Fox Run Rd; Jean Louis Weicker, 27 Fox Run Rd.

Chair Cohen convened the meeting at 7:30 PM

Emergency Evacuation notice: Read by Lisa Mustapich, Clerk

Note: All meeting submittals are available for review in the Planning Office.

DEVELOPMENT PERMITTING: 614 and 616 Springs Road and 10 Green Street (land off Fox Run and Buehler Roads): Public Hearing to review a Planned Residential Development (PRD) under Zoning Bylaw Section 9 and Subdivision Rules and Regulations.

MOTION: Ms. Mustapich moved to open the public meeting at 7:35. On a request from the Chair, Ms. Mustapich read the duly posted Legal Notice pertaining to this matter.

Mr. Hanagan seconded the motion to open the Public Hearing which passed unanimously.

The following documents were submitted by the applicant:

- Application booklet dated July 5, 2016, from DeVellis Consulting Group, Bedford, including cover letter, development statement addressing ZBL Section 9, architectural floor plans and

elevations for Fox Run units, site plan application and checklist, GIS location plan, Form C (subdivision) application for approval of definitive plan, and abutter lists;

- Plan set (22 sheets including cover) dated July 1, 2016 titled Planned Residential Development, 616 Springs Road, Bedford, Massachusetts, prepared by BSC Group of Boston, MA;
- Architectural elevations and floor plans (6 sheets) for house at 11 Notre Dame Road – presumed to be illustrative of the larger houses proposed for Buehler Road;
- Stormwater Report dated July 1, 2016 by BSC Group.

The Board also had in hand:

- Memo dated July 29, 2016 from Assistant Planner Catherine Perry, covering: background, property location and character, description of development, regulatory framework, consultations, discussion of various aspects/issues, and conclusion, and appending photographs of the site;
- Supplementary memo dated August 3, 2016 from Catherine Perry, with a few points of information/clarification
- Memo dated July 21, 2016 from Public Works Engineer Adrienne St. John, providing comments for both Planning Board and Conservation Commission, based on plan set last revised July 13, 2016 (with minor changes to stormwater system);
- Two memos dated July 15, 2016 from Fire Department Captain Charles Stone, with recommendations on the two built portions of the development;
- Email dated July 14 from Public Health Director Heidi Porter, with comments in relation to public health permitting;
- Memo dated July 29, 2016 from Conservation Administrator Elizabeth Bagdonas, noting that the Conservation Commission has opened its hearing on the Notice of Intent application but continued it to August 10, and identifying some issues, and appending a GIS map and a plan from a former (unapproved) proposal for the Green Street parcel for reference;
- Letters received from neighbors: AnnaLisa Madison, 29 Fox Run Road, Margot and Ira Holzman, 32 Fox Run Road, Jean-Louis and Annemarie Weicker, 27 Fox Run Road, and Hal Moore, 10 Copeland Drive.

Mr. Cohen recognized Brian DeVellis, representing David Bernstein, Springs Road Development LLC. Mr. DeVellis is a landscape architect and land use attorney with Lombardo DeVellis & Smith LLP, specializing in open space development. He has worked on other Bedford residential developments such as Huckins Farm and Sweeney Ridge and is also a resident of the town.

Mr. DeVellis acknowledged two BSC Group surveyors/ engineers— Frank DiPetro and Marissa Nesbitt— and gave a brief bio of the developer David Bernstein, a Bedford resident, who has built “traditional, single-family homes” for about 25 years.

Describing the project, Mr. DeVellis said there are 3 parcels of land involved—roughly 13 acres— that would be used to create a Planned Residential Development (PRD). Parcel #1 is .6 acres with the majority of road frontage on Fox Run Road, although the legal address is Springs Road. Parcel #2 (3.2 acres) is landlocked and sits on the Bedford-Billerica line. Parcel #3 (10 acres), although called “Green Street”, is accessed via Buehler Road in the Governor Winthrop Estates. There is no access from Green Street itself although residents may have been notified as abutters based on assessors’ maps, Mr. DeVellis said.

Parcel #1 is owned by developer Bernstein/Springs Road Development LLC. He has purchase and sale agreements to buy Parcel #2 (currently owned by Barbara Hagan) and Parcel #3 (currently owned by

Frank Pino). Mr. DeVellis calculates the total tract area of the three parcels to be 13.72 acres. Wetland encompasses over half of the total acreage leaving 6.53 acres for development.

Mr. DeVellis said the current plan is to construct 9 new cluster-style, “senior-oriented” homes on the land near Fox Run; retain the 1 existing dwelling at 614 Springs Road; and build 3 larger, conventional homes near Buehler.

The development team has worked on the project for close to a year and in that time has experimented with different scenarios for merging the three properties and creating an access point to the landlocked parcel. Mr. DeVellis stated Fox Run has been identified as the only viable access because Town Manager Rick Reed did not favor using Springs Road in Billerica as the direct access due to factors such as emergency response and snow removal. He noted the new road entrance would intersect with Fox Run about 200 feet from the northernmost intersection with Springs Road.

On April 26, 2016, a conceptual plan was presented to the Planning Board. The Conservation Commission has since approved the resource area delineation, so that wetland and buffer lines are now understood. The development team has met several times with Planning staff and has also met with staff from other technical reviewing departments to discuss subjects such as emergency access, drainage, road width and road ownership. The developer also held an independent meeting for neighbors and met further with individuals and small groups.

Mr. DeVellis said there was a discrepancy between the kind of emergency/ large vehicle turnaround the Fire Dept. said it preferred during a meeting—a “T” turnaround – and the “circle turn” preferred in the letter in hand from Chief Grunes dated July 15, 2016.

Mr. DeVellis met with the Bedford Housing Partnership on June 13, 2016 to discuss the PRD’s affordable housing units. The affordable units would be owned, not rented. Now, with a survey of the land done and designs completed, the formal application and public hearing are next steps of the process. Using PowerPoint slides that included neighborhood maps, revised site layouts, and new landscape designs for the perimeter buffer areas, Mr. DeVellis described the PRD housing and assured the Board that the specifications met all necessary codes and wetland setback requirements. He said that sightline buffers/ screening and berm creation were discussed at length with the neighborhood. Upper-canopy berm plantings such as hemlock and spruce plus an under-canopy tier of broadleaf evergreen such as mountain laurel, holly, and rhododendron are planned.

Concerns about channeling water run-off away from Fox Run properties resulted in plans for an additional berm on the edge of the development facing 20 Fox Run to funnel drainage and provide visual screening. Existing-though-unofficial pedestrian pathways to the bike path that would be lost in the development process would be replicated and access improved.

For the Buehler Road-end group of 3 large houses, Mr. DeVellis said the road would be 22 ft. wide coming off the existing cul-de-sac. The homes are “sandwiched” within the 50 ft. setback for the PRD and the 50 ft. setback for the wetlands. The houses would have sprinkler systems, per request of the Fire Dept. and there would be closed infiltration systems to accommodate roof runoff. Light fixtures would be 16-20 ft. tall, “urban park series” with full light cutoffs.

Returning to the smaller houses off Fox Run Road, Mr. DeVellis said the 9 homes would be “senior-oriented” or “starter homes” with first floor master suites, 2-car garages, 2 upstairs bedrooms, and a full

basement. There are “a variety of elevations” and roof styles. There is one 2-unit duplex included which Mr. DeVellis called “massive”. He speculated that if these were to be the affordable units, one-car garages might be substituted to minimize overall size.

Planning Board Questions: Mr. Hanegan asked about the design of a hypothetical conventional subdivision instead of the PRD. Mr. DeVellis said he did not have such plans with him but suggested that Fox Run would accommodate 4 conventional units. The going lot size for a conventional home with a 2 - 3 car garage is 48,000-54,000 sq. ft. and market-rate prices start at \$1M.

Responding to Mr. Hanegan’s question about the anticipated smaller homes’ prices, Mr. DeVellis said the market rate of such a home is around \$800,000 currently. “Our goal is to set ourselves away from the McMansions and be a step above the cottages that are on South Road. We think there is a strong market for downsizers who want to stay in town and who have built up equity in their current home.”

Mr. Hanegan asked how many school children are expected from the development. Mr. DeVellis said the smaller units will not be not age-restricted but, in his experience, houses without large yards do not attract families. Conventional homes can have 3-4 children and houses like those proposed off Fox Run Road have “less than two.”

Mr. Hanegan asked about creating access from Springs Road instead of Fox Run. Mr. DeVellis said this would “make a bad condition worse” since 3 roads would converge on a curve without good sightlines.

Ms. Lloyd asked about price points for the 3 larger homes. Mr. DeVellis said he was not prepared to answer that question.

Ms. Lloyd said the lots of these three houses were very large. Mr. DeVellis said there was a large amount of land area and the lots needed to be large in order to make the open space numbers work. Ms. Perry said Mr. DeVellis’ calculations were based on a misunderstanding of the rules for the common open space. “There’s no problem adding additional wetland to the open space, you simply have to make sure that 50% of the *minimum* amount of open space is upland,” Ms. Perry explained. Mr. DeVellis said he could “scale those lots back” so that more land would be designated open space.

Ms. Hackman asked if there was a plan to provide access to the bike path from the new road and Fox Run. Mr. DeVellis indicated an open space trail coming off the cul-de-sac. He added that ConsCom said they were in favor of a trail but they would need to see a plan before approving it. Mr. DeVellis said that plans that show the new road infringing on the wetland buffer have now been corrected.

Ms. Mustapich questioned Mr. DeVellis’ assumption on low numbers of school age children in the PRD, saying that when she sees a 3 bedroom home that includes a den with a door and a closet, she sees a 4-bedroom home. “Families will accept a house without a yard to get into a better school system. I’d like you to delve into that more and come back with a realistic number of children.”

She expressed concern about the proposal to construct berms, saying that piling dirt up would kill the trees. She also questioned including hemlocks in the tree mix due to their susceptibility to disease.

Ms. Mustapich said that the affordable units in the PRD can’t differ from the market rate units and they must be disbursed through the development. “Clustering the affordable units using the one existing house and the two duplexes probably isn’t going to pass muster.”

Ms. Mustapich asked about setting up a Home Owners' Association (HOA) instead of asking for the road to be accepted by the Town. She added that she prefers a T turnaround to a circle to avoid "gratuitous pavement." Mr. DeVellis said he would look into the question of school age kids, the use of hemlock, and the affordable unit mix. As for the HOA, he proposes creating an HOA but still intends to ask the Town to accept the road as public, using the HOA agreement as an oversight mechanism much like the arrangement at Sweeney Ridge.

Mr. Cohen asked about a contradiction between a statement that the stormwater runoff situation would be improved and the runoff tables that seem to forecast no change from existing levels. Mr. DiPetro, civil engineer from BSC, responded that the development is not permitted to increase the level of runoff so the plan is for that standard to be met with stormwater management systems for each portion of the development. The water would be treated/filtered and eventually released back to the wetland environment as required. The systems are designed for 100 yr. storm capacity. Mr. Cohen noted that the answer did not address his questions about the contradiction in the report.

Mr. Cohen asked about the capacity of the Buehler Road houses vis-à-vis visitor parking and logistics for weekly trash/recycling pick-up. Mr. DeVellis said each house would have room for 2 indoor and 2 outdoor parked cars. There is a newly proposed trash and mailbox "staging area" that's away from the pedestrian path (on the Buehler Road turning circle). The shared driveway for the new houses would be privately owned and maintained.

Mr. Cohen said the 20 ft. planned dead end roadway off Fox Run is too narrow. "I have concerns if there are cars parked on the street that emergency vehicles wouldn't be able to pass safely. Part of me is leaning toward having a cul-de-sac (turning circle) there for better circulation."

Mr. DeVellis said his goal is to minimize the impact of impervious surfaces but he would look at making the road 22 ft wide.

Mr. Cohen said a two car garage plan for Fox Run is geared more toward starter homes than downsizers. "There is a need for starter homes in town but I don't know if those fall into the \$800,000 price point. I think these would attract families. Given the location, it's removed from the amenities so it may not be attractive to empty nesters."

Ms. Perry said that there is an important question of whether the new road will be public or private. She pointed out that the DPW's comments were based on the road remaining private. "They said they wouldn't support it being accepted as a public road; they have serious reservations about the spacing of the houses on a narrow road and with small front yards. They are concerned about the difficulties of snow removal. You might have to change the design if you want it to be accepted." Additionally, Ms. Perry said there is no ambiguity in the bylaw about how the number of affordable housing units must be calculated (giving 3 rather than 2 in this case) and that she'd made the rules clear to the applicant prior to the submission of the application.

Mr. DeVellis said he will talk to Mr. Bernstein about the question of ownership of the new road. "When we had our technical review, it was very clear we wanted to propose this as a public road, designed to public standards."

Public Comments: Before recognizing members of the public at the microphone, Mr. Cohen first acknowledged a number of letters the Board had received pertaining to this PRD application.

Robert Annese, attorney for 5 abutting/neighborhood households said many neighbors would prefer to see a 4 lot subdivision off Fox Run instead of a 9 plus 1 clustered development. He called Fox Run Road “a tranquil neighborhood” that has become inundated by speeding cut-through traffic.

Water in peoples’ basements is already an issue that is expected to worsen with additional development. Mr. Annese asked that a bond be put in place by the developer to be used by homeowners in the event they experience more flooding than in the past.

Water pressure in the neighborhood is extremely low. Homeowners need assurances it won’t worsen.

Mr. Annese asked what benefit the neighborhood would derive from the development. “This is good for the Town because we’re getting affordable housing units and it’s good for the developer because he will make more money with a [PRD] than with a conventional 4-unit development. The neighbors are being left out of the equation. This is a disruption to this quiet, tranquil neighborhood. If it goes through, the neighbors would want a say about the vegetation, the buffering and the like... There would be less trees cut down for a 4-lot subdivision which would be a help with respect to water drainage.”

He added that the Madison home at 29 Fox Run would experience light pollution impacts from cars exiting the new road after dark. “Maybe the mouth of the exit way could be slanted 45 degrees. And maybe the Planning Board can consider having that be a left-hand turn only.”

Mr. Annese said he had concerns about fire trucks turning in and out of the new road.

In response, Mr. DeVellis said the DPW doesn’t like intersections to be anything other than 90 degrees. Mr. Cohen asked Mr. Annese to clarify how a bond or security would work to compensate for future wet basements when those basements already get wet. “How do you measure that it’s gotten worse?” Mr. Annese replied that the difference would be measured in frequency and volume.

As for the traffic study, Mr. Cohen said the size of the development doesn’t warrant having one done.

During the following 1 ½ hours, numerous residents came to the microphone to voice both overlapping and individual concerns: more traffic; speeding traffic; water pressure; arrangements for trash and recycling bins at the Buehler-end development; snow removal and storage; drainage; wet basements and high indoor humidity; a changing town and changing landscapes; minimization of impact to the tranquil neighborhood; height of the new houses; tax increases caused by additional school-age children; the large size of the 3 Buehler houses that “won’t match the rest of the neighborhood”; the vehicular access/maneuvering pattern to the new houses from the Buehler circle; parking; emergency access on narrow roads; wetlands/ walking trail impacts and any new pedestrian/bike access; whether the smaller homes as planned would be appealing/marketable; the density and how that fits the neighborhood vernacular; over-building or “shoe-horning in” new developments; whether the proposal should be considered as two separate developments; what the significance of old “paper streets” as shown on the Existing Conditions plan is.

Ms. Hackman asked Ms. Perry to clarify how many houses would be allowed if the development was a by right, conventional subdivision not a PRD. Ms. Perry said it wasn’t possible to be precise without doing a layout, with roads to provide frontage, but her estimate is 3 on the land off Fox Run, given the amount of upland (non-wetlands), and a low number off Buehler with a road extension.

Board comments: Ms. Mustapich said she appreciated the neighbors’ concerns. “[The PRD] is terribly dense for this property and I would be amenable to considering something more conventional.” She added that about 2 children should be expected from most of the 13 houses.

Ms. Hackman said, “People have the right to develop their property... We don’t have it in our power to stop it... Just because we approve a development doesn’t necessarily mean we think it’s a good location.” The reason the Planning Board considers cluster-like development, she added, is because the homes are smaller, they serve a broader population of people, and the Town gets public amenities. She said she’d personally never seen a traffic problem any time of the day on Fox Run. She disagreed that people would park on Fox Run to get access to the Rail Trail and said the improved connectivity would be a benefit to the neighborhood. The upland area that would become open space could be used as a park or other type of passive recreation resource.

Ms. Hackman said she was open to considering a conventional development instead. She pointed out, however, that an impervious surface calculation (done by retired Planning Director Glenn Garber) showed the conventional vs. PRD footprints as similar.

Ms. Hackman said she had a lot of faith in the DPW’s review of the stormwater calculations and that the state’s standards have gotten stricter. However, the water pressure issues should be addressed. “Making it worse can’t happen,” she said.

As for the density of the homes in both portions of the development, she believes there should be fewer homes. Ms. Hackman noted that several Town departments consulted say there are too many units. She feels there is a “massing effect” from large homes like the ones planned for Buehler and that it’s a detriment to the neighborhood.

Ms. Lloyd agreed it was important to improve connectivity and bike path access. She was pleased with the dimensions of the Fox Run homes but less so with the dimensions of the larger residences off Buehler. She agreed with Ms. Mustapich that the Fox Run houses would be thought of as 4 bedroom units and would therefore attract families. The density looks “shoehorned” and “is not at all sensitive to the context”, she added, calling it disingenuous to categorize the smaller houses as “senior-oriented.”

Ms. Lloyd deemed the topographical plans deficient in detail. “This is back to context.” She wanted to see the positions of the houses that are across the streets and information on the land behind the abutters houses. “It needs to be clear what the flow lines are.”

Ms. Lloyd added that she’s not opposed to narrow road widths but she does want to see snow storage plans. She questioned whether the trash/ mail area off Buehler should be in the Town’s right-of-way.

Ms. Lloyd said it is not the practice of the Town to accept PRD roads as public ways. “I would not stand in favor of it at Town Meeting.”

Mr. Hanegan clarified that a PRD is not by-right; a PRD is approved at the discretion of the Planning Board if there is a compelling public benefit that “justifies the density bonus”. Addressing Mr. DeVellis, he said, “Right now, frankly, I don’t see that. This [hearing] will be continued and there will be ideally some improvements made in the PRD based on the feedback you’ve gotten. The by-right [conventional] development would be an alternative here. I’d like to see that sketched out.”

Mr. Hanegan said a 22 ft. road would be better than either 20 ft. or 24 ft. He would like a realistic assessment of school aged children because he also doesn’t see the PRD as “senior –oriented”. He shares Ms. Lloyd’s desire for better topographical information and asked for a street-level view of what the residents of the neighborhood would see once the development is completed. He agreed that the water pressure situation is unacceptable.

The hydrological survey should also be more in-depth. Because the model might be off, Mr. Hanegan

said, “We need some confidence that this will actually improve things.”

On the subject of access directly from Springs Road, Ms. Perry confirmed that it could be problematic for coordinating, managing and funding a variety of services, including utilities and emergency services. Mr. Hanegan said he was nonetheless in favor of “some kind of alternative” being developed.

Mr. Cohen said that although the Planning Board has the ability to approve the PRD, the Board needs to be comfortable that the intent of the bylaw will be met. “This seems like it’s two separate developments, two different neighborhoods. On the matter of being treated under the umbrella of one PRD—I’d really have to look more closely at the bylaw to conclude that it meets the intent of the bylaw instead of just looking at the numbers and saying the math works.” He agreed that less density would be better and added that the best way to address the water pressure is to build fewer homes. He, too, asked to see what a standard subdivision would look like.

Mr. DeVellis asked for a straw poll on the topic of the new road off Fox Run. Mr. Cohen and Ms. Hackman said they would approve of a private, 22 ft. wide road with a cul-de-sac turnaround. Ms. Mustapich said was opposed to additional impervious surface but acknowledged the importance of input from the Fire department. Ms. Lloyd said she was fine as long as it meets the national standards and there’s a reduction of impervious surfaces. Mr. Hanegan said he’d defer to the Fire department.

Mr. DeVellis defended the engineers’ stormwater study and topographical mapping, saying it was “not thrown together” and that it had been reviewed by the relevant departments. “I can’t say what happens in peoples’ basements now but our engineer is telling us we’re going to do our best to not make it worse and if we can make it better, we’ll look at those numbers.”

Mr. Cohen asked Selectmen Mark Siegenthaler if the Police could station an officer on Fox Run/Springs Road to monitor traffic. Mr. Siegenthaler said he would share the residents’ concern about driving behavior with the Police.

MOTION: Ms. Mustapich moved to continue the Public Hearing on the matter of **614 and 616 Springs Road and 10 Green Street** to the August 30th meeting. Mr. Hanegan seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

BUSINESS ITEMS:

1) Great Road Zoning Project RFP Evaluation Process: Mr. Cohen announced that the RFP is “on the streets” and advertisements have been placed in the Bedford Minuteman and other publications. Applications are due August 31, 2016.

Town Manager Reed has asked whether the Planning Board wants to participate as a whole or as a subgroup. After discussion, it was decided that Ms. Lloyd and Mr. Hanegan would represent the Board with the role of evaluating the technical merits of submitted proposals. The Town Manager will act as the Chief Procurement Officer and have the final decision about how the contract will be awarded. The goal is to have a consultant in place in September. The project itself is expected to take 18 months.

Once the consultant is in place, Mr. Cohen suggested that an ad hoc committee of multiple stakeholders will be formed to provide input into the Great Road Zoning, similar to committee that was established for the Comprehensive Plan. Others pointed out that the RFP outlines some of the procedures. Mr. Cohen said he would work with Ms. Perry to reach out to the relevant committees by letter “to let them know their participation is key” and so those involved can schedule their time accordingly.

Mr. Cohen said he plans to go to the Chamber of Commerce meeting on August 31 to hear about their market study. Ms. Lloyd is interested as well.

2) Potential minor Zoning Amendments for Special Fall Town Meeting: Ms. Perry presented a list of potential amendments to clarify or correct a number of minor issues in the zoning bylaw, some long-standing and some more recent. Although the Board had discussed “taking this fall Town Meeting off”, Mr. Cohen suggested the current list of zoning revisions might be easily tackled and the articles could be bundled. Ms. Perry explained that the timeline is tight. Public hearings about any intended revisions would have to be advertised soon.

Ms. Perry said she’d shown the zoning revision list to Code Enforcement Officer Chris Laskey. He said he’d like to find a way to clarify fencing guidelines. Ms. Perry suspects the topic of fencing to be more controversial than the others so she’s inclined to put it off until spring Annual Town Meeting. The Board agreed.

Ms. Lloyd voiced reservations about the zoning revision that would require an engineer’s stamp for site plan applications, saying it might present undue burden for small alterations. Ms. Mustapich said she’d prefer the protection that the stamp would provide and, in the scheme of things, the cost is minimal. Further discussion was postponed until the Public Hearing, which it was agreed to plan for Sept. 13.

REPORTS/DEVELOPMENT UPDATE:

Development Update Chart

In response to Ms. Perry’s updated chart, Ms. Hackman said she was glad to see that the DPW planned to address dangerous sightlines for vehicles entering/exiting Carleton-Willard.

Liaison updates:

Middlesex 3 Coalition

Ms. Hackman reported on a meeting of the Transportation Committee of the Middlesex 3 Coalition. Some highlights:

- The Coalition is trying to obtain services from Lyft for “emergency ride home” situations;
- Bedford and the Coalition are investigating getting Zagster to offer a bike-sharing program in conjunction with Park-N-Pedal locations;
- The Coalition is trying to organize use of the shuttle buses for residents who want a ride to Alewife since inbound shuttles are empty;
- Bedford received a \$47,000 Community Transit Grant which represents 50% of the cost of funding;
- Ms. Hackman said an idea is taking hold for the participant towns to form a stronger transportation management association with a common transportation demand policy;
- Bus rapid transit on Route 3 has become a topic of greater interest. Ms. Hackman said the unused shoulder lane could be used as a bus/ HOV lane and the effort could be funded by a public/private partnership, although it was noted there is a barrier at the State level to expanding service. Ms. Hackman will follow up with Rep. Ken Gordon.

In closing, Ms. Hackman said the list of transportation priorities as presented is very good but she would like to add “improve bike access to Crosby Drive”.

Selectmen's Annual Goals

Ms. Lloyd noted the list of Selectmen's priorities and said she was especially pleased to see the items under "Charter, Bylaws and Regulations". About the first item—"Zoning Amendment for Recreational Marijuana Sales"—Selectmen Siegenthaler said its inclusion was due to the recent attempt by Seven Point to locate a medical marijuana dispensary on Great Road near the center of town. The second item of particular interest to the Planning Board is "Zoning/Residential Redevelopment." No clear timeline has been established for discussing either item.

MINUTES: On a motion made by Ms. Lloyd and seconded by Ms. Mustapich, the minutes of June 21, 2016 were **unanimously** approved as amended.

On a motion made by Mr. Hanegan and seconded by Ms. Mustapich, the minutes of July 12, 2016 were **unanimously** approved as amended.

FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE: Next meeting, August 30. Ms. Hackman will be away for Sept. 13th meeting. Dates are planned through the end of October but still need to be extended through the new year.

ADJOURNMENT: On a motion made by Ms. Lloyd and seconded by Ms. Hackman, the Planning Board voted **unanimously** to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,

Kim Siebert
Recording Secretary