

BEDFORD PLANNING BOARD
Town Hall Multipurpose Room
Minutes
August 30, 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: Robert Annese, 2 Shire Lane (attorney for of abutters/neighbors); David Bernstein, 21 Alaska Ave (project developer); Aaron Bourret, 8 Glen Ora Dr ; Pat Byrne, 5 Fox Run Rd; Carolyn Carbone, 38 Buehler Rd ; Brian Devellis, 41 North Rd, DeVellis Consulting; Melinda Dietrich, 19 Notre Dame; Frank DiPetro, 803 Summer St, Boston, BSC Group; Shawn Doherty, 36 Buehler Rd ; Rosemary Dyer, 4 Fox Run Dr; Caroline Fedele, Selectman; Tony Fields, newly-hired Bedford Planning Director; Barry Gaman, 5 Fox Run Rd; Jeff Gilman 20 Buehler Rd; Susan Goodman, 1 Copeland Dr; Susan Grieb, 26 Fox Run Rd; Gail Hartwell, 35 Elmbrook Rd; Thomas Hirsch, 24 Fox Run Dr; Ira Holtzman, 32 Fox Run Dr; Margot Holtzman, 32 Fox Run Dr; Roberta Jaffer, 33 Buehler Rd; Jim Johnson, 9 Fox Run Rd; Frederick Klatt, 30 Fox Run Dr; Greg Kordelski, 11 Copeland Rd; Barbara Kovall, 18 Fox Run Dr; Annalisa Madison, 29 Fox Run Dr; Richard Madison, 29 Fox Run Dr; Karen Moore, 10 Copeland Dr; Alan Nelson, 25 Fox Run Dr; Marissa Nesbitt, 803 Summer St, Boston/BSC Group; Derek Peplau, 37 Buehler Rd; Rick Reed, Town Manager; Eliza Rosenberry, The Bedford Citizen; Lori Reubenstein, 18 Buehler Rd; Keenan Ross, 2 Fox Run Rd; Mark Siegenthaler, Selectmen; Lowell Stern, 13 Fox Run Rd; Lawrence Ting, 3 Glen Ora Dr; Julie Turner, The Bedford Citizen; Jeff Venuti, 1 Fox Run Dr; Annemarie Weicker, 27 Fox Run Dr; Jean Louis Weicker, 27 Fox Run Dr; Gerry Wilcox, 92 Kendall Court; Yiwen Zhang 12 Fox Run Rd.

At approximately 7:30, Mr. Cohen opened the meeting and convened the continuation of the August 3 Public Hearing.

The Emergency Evacuation notice was read by Lisa Mustapich, Clerk

DEVELOPMENT PERMITTING: Review of Planned Residential Development (PRD) under Zoning Bylaw Section 9 and Subdivision Rules and Regulations. Re: **614 and 616 Springs Road and 10 Green Street** (land off Fox Run and Buehler Roads).

The following documents were submitted by the applicant:

- Plan set consisting of twenty-two (22) sheets prepared by BSC Group dated July 13, 2016, Revised: August 26, 2016: G-100 Title Sheet, G-101 Legend & General Notes, V-100-V-101 Existing Conditions, C-100-C-101 Key Plan, C-102-103 Erosion and Sediment Control, C-104-C-105 Layout and Materials, C-106-C-107 Grading and Drainage, C-108-C-109 Utility Plan, C-110 Roadway Plan & Profile, C-111 Locus Plan,

C-200- C-201-C-202 Civil Details, L-100-L-101 Landscape Plans and Details, L-102 Lighting; (*Note:C-201is not listed on Title Sheet*)

- Letter from DeVellis Consulting Group to Mr. Jeffrey Cohen, Bedford Planning Board dated August 25, 2016 addressing ten (10) specific concerns;
- Copy of letter/report from Graves Engineering to David Bernstein, Subject: Hydraulic Assessment Bedford Water Distribution System.

Also in hand:

- Letter from Adrienne St. John, Public Works Engineer to Catherine Perry, Assistant Planning Director and Elizabeth Bagdonas, Conservation Administrator Re: Planned Residential Development (PRD):614 & 616 Springs Rd/Green St dated August 30, 2016;
- Email from Fire Dept. dated August 9, 2016, identifying four aspects that the Department would like to see confirmed. Message to Planning Board from Margot and Ira Holtzman, 32 Fox Run Road Re: Fox Run Road Planned Residential Development;
- Letter from Rosemary M. Dyer, 4 Fox Run Road dated August 23, 2016 to Shawn Hannigan (sic) & Members of the Board;
- Memo with comments from Catherine Perry, Assistant Planner to Planning Board dated August 26, 2016;
- Email letter dated August 30, 2016 from Terry Gleason, Bicycle Advisory Committee, in favor of a bike trail opposite Glen Ora Drive and discussion of a public park alongside the rail trail.

Mr. DeVellis opened his presentation by addressing ten areas of concern as identified at the August 3 meeting:

- 1) Density: The density of the project has been scaled down from a yield of 13 units to a total of 11. The Buehler Road part of the project is now proposed as 2 units, not 3; Fox Run is now proposed as 8 units, instead of 9, plus the existing house at 614 Springs Rd.
- 2) Alignment: The angle of the road to/from the Fox Run development has been changed from 90 degrees to 75 degrees in deference to the Madisons' concern about headlights flashing into their home at 29 Fox Run Road. Mr. DeVellis stated that Adrienne John, DPW Engineer, "is not uncomfortable" with the change of angle. The new alignment would also encourage a left turn out of the new road, toward Springs Road, instead of a right turn that would take vehicles down the length of Fox Run.
- 3) On the Buehler side, the alignment of the shared driveway also changed, shifting it away from the neighbor's driveway. Conventional subdivision: On the Fox Run site, the developers believe they would be able to build 4 by-right conventional homes. Mr. DeVellis noted, however, that the Planning Board would have no leverage with a conventional sub-division with respect to how many trees are kept (although Conservation will weigh in), house size, location, or orientation, other than what's spelled out in the regulations. Additionally, there'd be no trail connection, no buffering or landscaping required and there would be no affordable units.
- 4) Buehler lots are too large: Mr. DeVellis acknowledged that the original plan for this part of the PRD was based on a misunderstanding of the upland/wetland ratio for the

Common Open Space. Subsequently, the house lots have been decreased to less than ½ acre each, maximizing open space. Also, with two homes instead of three, there's more room for snow storage. The isolated "upland common area" of "almost 2 acres" could be a "pocket park" that could also function as "a pull-off area for the bike trail with benches and landscaping."

In the PRD plan, there are 2.3 acres of wetland open space on the Buehler side and 4 acres on the Fox Run side. In all, Mr. DeVellis said there is a total of 10 open space acres.

- 5) Fox Run road too narrow: In response to concerns, the width of the new road has been increased to 22 feet. The road will be privately owned and maintained by a Homeowners' Association (HOA). With the reduction of one home in the cluster, there is now room for a cul-de-sac circle and a 5-foot wide sidewalk on one side. The developers will also amend their application to the Conservation Commission to include a trail from this area that will be composed of compact gravel for the first 15 feet. The rest of the trail would be "natural grade" and include "floating boardwalks" where needed.
- 6) Water Pressure: The developer engaged Graves Engineering to assess what has been described as chronically low water pressure in the Buehler and Fox Run neighborhoods. The results of the flow tests show that "adding ten homes to the area won't negatively impact the available water pressure." In later comments, Ms. Perry said her understanding of the problem is that the elevation of these neighborhoods is close to that of the water tank that feeds them.
- 7) School impacts: Mr. DeVellis used town census, assessor's and school data to calculate how many school children the project should generate. If the 11 unit PRD is built as intended, Mr. DeVellis estimates 4.38 children will be added to the school system; if the development is a conventional subdivision, only 1.69 children would be added.
- 8) Paper Streets: Mr. DeVellis said that these "streets" were part of "a common scheme that was developed in the past but never put on record". Easements are shown on the Town's GIS. The fee titles are held by Mr. Pino and will convey to Mr. Bernstein with the anticipated real estate transaction. Mr. Vellis said that the paper streets can be dissolved.
- 9) Architecture: New drawings were not supplied but Mr. DeVellis said that the Fox Run home designs have been altered to address the potential for a 4th bedroom. "We put a loft on the third floor, took out the closet, and made an alcove/entertainment center so it's a three bedroom— one bedroom downstairs and two upstairs." He added that the deeds could restrict the units to a maximum of three bedrooms.
- 10) Survey: Without the ability to survey on private property, Mr. DeVellis said the plan set and exhibits will include an overlay on the Town's GIS.

Additional details:

Fox Run: Snow storage will be in the middle of the cul-de-sac. Drainage systems are now all subsurface. The slope coming off Fox Run is 3%. Some under-canopy plantings of mountain laurel and spruce trees will be added per discussions with Fox Run residents.

Buehler: The two homes will share a single 14-foot driveway. The homes will have interior fire sprinklers per request of the Fire Dept. Utilities will be underground. The existing trail to the narrow gauge trail will come off of the cul-de-sac. Buffers and screening are planned between the new development and the existing Buehler Road houses per discussions with one of the abutters.

The pocket park would be created by clearing an understory area roughly 25' by 60' in size and adding 3 park benches, landscape fabric, and bark mulch.

Questions from the Board: Mr. Cohen asked Assistant Planner Perry to provide her comments.

Ms. Perry said that she is encouraged by some of the sensitive responses the developer has made to concerns expressed on August 3. However, the information remains incomplete. That being the case, her advice to the Board is to postpone its decision until a subsequent continuation of the Public Hearing. Documents recently submitted by the developer require more time for review; DPW engineers were only able to perform a quick perusal of the revised drainage report but had "a couple of concerns that were of a relatively detailed nature."

Also:

- Existing trees to be kept or removed should be shown as such on the plans;
- With the clustered design, there would be significant re-grading necessary which should be considered carefully;
- Propane tank placement should be evaluated by the Fire Department;
- The Housing Partnership has yet to visit the existing house to evaluate it for use as an affordable unit;
- The construction of the trail should be reviewed and approved by Conservation; it may be possible to extend the gravel portion further;
- The potential for a bike trail access opposite Glen Ora Drive should be researched per Bicycle Advisory Committee request.

About the hydraulic analysis done by Graves Engineering, Ms. Perry said the DPW is in general agreement that an additional 10 houses won't make the problem materially worse.

Mr. Hanegan asked if the street views he asked about at the last meeting could be created. Mr. DeVellis said they haven't been done yet but they will be provided once the Board's feedback is understood.

Mr. Hanegan said the revised water runoff model looks the same as the first model, with identical pre-development and post-development figures. BSC's Frank DiPetro said the numbers are the same because the same area of runoff is going into the wetlands, although the water will now be channeled into the closed drainage systems.

Mr. Hanegan summarized: "It sounds like what you believe, in the whole area affected by development, that the storm water problem will be lessened by the addition of your [subsurface systems]. Is that what you're saying?"

Mr. DiPetro replied that any pollution would go through the filtration system and be treated. Also, some of the water that now runs off the site would instead be collected and released more gradually into the wetlands. He added there is 10-11% more capacity in the drainage systems than strictly needed for 100-year storm events.

Mr. Hanegan closed by saying he will take very seriously what the abutters think about a conventional subdivision vs. PRD.

Ms. Mustapich asked who would be responsible for maintenance of the pocket park. Mr. DeVellis said it would be designed for low maintenance, the HOA would take care of it and the Conservation Commission would be involved.

Ms. Mustapich said the Housing Partnership was struggling with the concept of accepting the existing 4 bedroom house as one of the affordable units. She asked if the Partnership's walk-through had been scheduled. Mr. DeVellis replied that the Partnership has no experience with accepting existing homes so they are researching the matter. Mr. Bernstein has also agreed to do a home inspection (scheduled 8/31) before the walk through.

Ms. Mustapich asked how the developers would enforce the deed restriction to keep the 3 bedroom homes from becoming 4 bedroom homes. Mr. DeVellis said that in order to convert them to 4 bedrooms, the home owner would have to apply for a permit. "We rely on people doing what they need to do and what they should do."

Ms. Mustapich said she didn't believe that this number of units would only yield 1-4 school enrollments. Mr. DeVellis said he was happy to recalculate but since the numbers came from the Town census, he didn't know how else to make an estimate. Ms. Mustapich suggested focusing more on families with children and noted that the average reproduction rate is 1.9 for women of childbearing age.

Ms. Hackman asked if the upland portion on the rail trail could be deeded to the Town. "I want to make sure there is public access." Mr. DeVellis said an easement could be given through the HOA for that portion but added that the whole 10 acres could be deeded to the Town. "I don't think the Town would like that," he said. "It takes it off the tax rolls, it requires maintenance but if you guys direct us to, we'd be happy to do it."

Ms. Hackman asked if Mr. DeVellis had given thought to the Bicycle Advisory Committee's request to have the trail access be the extension of Glen Ora. He replied that he needs to research who owns it because Mr. Pino only has an easement to it for a water line. He will get back to the Board about it.

Ms. Hackman asked about the height and safety of the "floating boardwalks". Mr. DeVellis replied that this design was recommended by Conservation. "It's essentially Hancor piping with planks laid on that just rests on the ground."

Mr. Cohen asked where the developers stood with Conservation. Mr. DeVellis said he'd met with the Commission and would be back before them in September.

Looking at the conventional plan for Fox Run, Mr. Cohen asked if the new road angle was back to 90 degrees rather than the 75 degrees it had been shifted to in the PRD plan. Mr. DeVellis said it did revert to 90 degrees because otherwise the site wouldn't work for four lots. The road would also shift south about 25 feet to maximize the land and the existing house would be torn down.

Public Comments: Attorney for several Fox Run residents, Robert Annese, returned to some of the same issues he spoke to on August 3: flooding, parking, traffic, tree clearing, posting a bond in case flooding problems worsen after the development is built, changing the placid character of the neighborhood, density, and water pressure.

To address some of these concerns, Mr. Cohen asked Mr. DeVellis to comment first on how tree clearing would compare between the PRD and conventional plans on Fox Run. Mr. DeVellis said the clustered option would leave more of the existing trees. About density, Mr. DeVellis said the PRD wouldn't work financially with less than eight units here. About flooding concerns, he said—since the new units are downhill—the water that now pools on Fox Run will flow to the drainage systems in the development.

Mr. DeVellis confirmed that the price point of the Fox Run PRD units would be about \$800,000. Mr. DeVellis said the size of conventional homes, whether off Buehler or Fox Run, would be about 4,000 sq. ft. and the cluster units are designed to be about 2,200 sq. ft.

Several residents said the PRD is more like two projects than one because the plan for Fox Run and the plan for Buehler are so different from one another. The cluster of houses was also generally seen as being discordant with the rest of the neighborhood. The majority of residents who spoke to the issue was that a conventional 4-house subdivision is more desirable and would cause less upheaval. Richard Madison of 29 Fox Run had some reservations about this because a conventional development might be less sensitively related to his house opposite.

Other comments/concerns from the public included: snow placement; water pressure; density; skepticism about the accuracy of the school age children calculation; skepticism that people already in the neighborhood are interested to buy the new units; slope and wetland buffer encroachment; increased danger at the intersection of Fox Run and Springs with close proximity to Concord Road and the Middlesex Community College campus; the traffic pattern on the Buehler cul-de-sac; why propane tanks are planned for an area already served by natural gas; removal of trees; the pocket park as an amenity which to some minds is not a true public benefit; establishment of a bond to protect existing residents in the event flooding worsens after the development is built; and what would happen to “the ruins” (foundations and chimneys).

Mr. Cohen asked Mr. DeVellis what would happen if the water pressure worsened after the development is built. Mr. DeVellis said he isn't sure how to address that. “We have an engineer's report—that the DPW concurred with—that there's negligible impact. Do we put booster pumps in 60 houses?”

If the snow storage areas are found to be too small, Mr. DeVellis said a condition could be included to have the HOA remove the excess snow from the sites. He added that both new roads would be privately maintained and that smaller plows, rather than larger DPW trucks, would be used to clear the streets.

Mr. DeVellis said the planned propane tanks are subject to final approval by the Fire Dept. The tanks would be underground, not above; Mr. DeVellis reported that builders are using them more frequently for safety reasons.

Ms. Lloyd said she would prefer land be set aside for the pocket park so that the Town could work with vested parties to make a site-sensitive, user-friendly amenity. The developer could put money toward the park, rather than constructing it. Mr. DeVellis was agreeable.

Board comments: Before turning the meeting over to board comments, Mr. Cohen confirmed that the Planning Board would continue the Public Hearing at a later date.

Mr. Hanegan said he agreed with Ms. Mustapich and members of the public about the need to recalculate the number of school children.

Mr. Hanegan noted that most of the neighbors prefer the as-right 4-house conventional option for the parcel off Fox Run but he acknowledged Mr. Madison's preference for the cluster, based largely on concerns about the 90 degree street angle in the conventional plan. Noting that the street in the conventional model has moved 25 feet to the south—and to help understand how all the pieces would work in context— Mr. Hanegan once again asked Mr. DeVellis to provide a schematic based on a Google street view of the conventional subdivision.

Mr. Hanegan also shares the concerns of those who believe it would be difficult to stop a home owner from converting a 3 bedroom to a 4 bedroom.

Acknowledging the second proposal was better than the first, Mr. Hanegan nonetheless said he was not sure there was enough public benefit to justify the density of the cluster model. "It does seem out of character with the neighborhood...But the flip side of this is if we go to the conventional subdivision, the Planning Board loses a lot of say over what can happen. That may be better because we'd get less houses but at that point, and unless the builder violates certain rights, we have to accept that. My goal will be to do what's best for the neighborhood. That's what I'll be looking for at the next meeting."

Ms. Mustapich said she believes that change is inevitable and she agrees that developers should be able to maximize their investment. "But we're not here to rubber stamp things. Like Shawn said, when I weigh the public benefit of these units—we get a pocket park, path access, affordable unit (although the existing and the new unit have not yet been accepted), I still need to be sold...This is shoehorning in a [lot] of units into a small parcel. I'm going to have to hear some compelling reasons."

Ms. Mustapich sharply questioned the school age children calculation saying she sees something more along the lines of 20-24 enrollments. "We've been stung so many times by developers doing fuzzy math and underestimating the number kids."

Ms. Mustapich agreed that the project is more like two separate projects instead of one. She added, "I think there are a lot of questions that need to be answered before I can vote for this."

Ms. Lloyd said she believed the developers are doing “the standard math” to figure out the number of school children but, with the lure of excellent schools, “there’s nothing standard about the amount of development that’s been going on in Bedford.”

Ms. Lloyd addressed some misconceptions about a 4-unit conventional subdivision at Fox Run versus an 8 units of a PRD: Without advocating for one or the other, she pointed out that the amount of total sq. footage for one is about the same as for the other—16,000 sq. ft. in this case. “In terms of what you get visually of built environment—you get four massive houses instead of eight smaller, lower-slung structures,” she explained.

Seconding Mr. Hanegan, Ms. Lloyd repeated that the Planning Board would have virtually no input to a by-right subdivision.

As for the Buehler units, Ms. Lloyd said the reason the project was being presented as one instead of two is because the Buehler end doesn’t have enough frontage for a conventional development. “Which is why it’s being rolled into this PRD in a very unconventional way. I’m not completely opposed to an unconventional form of housing, if it’s of a benefit.” She went on to say she would prefer two houses to three on the Buehler side but she also would prefer that they be smaller than the proposed 4000 sq. ft.

Ms. Lloyd asked Mr. DeVellis to consider tilting the orientation of the houses to reduce cut and fill and position them more following the contour of the landscape. She approved of the elimination of one of the Fox Run houses but questioned separating the existing house on Springs Road from what would be its new neighborhood. “On the plan, it’s even landscaped to be separate from the cluster and a lot of the point of a PRD or cluster is to create a little pocket community. You’re excluding this house from the community.”

About the road in the conventional model, Ms. Lloyd said if the plan were flipped, as a resident suggested, DPW and Fire would not approve it because the road would come in right at the corner of Fox Run and Springs.

She suggested that the developer might offer the Madisons at 29 Fox Run some “low screening” to help buffer the headlights.

Ms. Lloyd suggested, to alleviate some of the neighbors’ concerns, that perhaps there is enough area behind unit #6 on the cul-de-sac for “two or three head-in [guest parking] spaces. There’s some room there before you get to the buffer zone.”

She concluded that there was still a lot of DPW engineering specifics that remained to be satisfied. “There’s a lot of fine tuning and questions still to be answered.”

Ms. Hackman said she believes there are enough public benefits to support approval of the PRD. Smaller houses are beneficial and there’s a market for them. “The looming effect of giant homes of a conventional development would detract from the neighborhood.” The gain of two affordable units is also compelling.

She sees the development as attracting a mix of people, not only families with children. Even if all the houses have children, Ms. Hackman agreed with Ms. Lloyd that it’s unreasonable to try to

bar families from moving in. “I note that at the last Town Meeting, each household was assessed \$30 to expand two elementary schools. I believe we can afford that. We need to be cautious, of course, but children are being born, they need to live somewhere, and this is a welcoming community.”

Additional access to the bike trail would fit in with the Town’s Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan, Ms. Hackman said.

Ms. Hackman appreciated the residents’ concerns about water pressure and flooding and acknowledged that flooding is a common concern throughout town. But, she added that she has faith in the careful analysis done by the DPW engineers and believes an approved storm water plan will work. “I wish there was something that could be done about the water pressure. I think people should keep talking to Public Works and the Town but I accept that this won’t effect it one way or the other.”

In conclusion, Ms. Hackman said: “I am leaning toward the PRD, although I understand it is unconventional, to say the least. I do think it will add something to the town in terms of providing alternatives to people who need somewhat smaller houses.”

Before making his comments, Mr. Cohen acknowledged receipt of two letters from abutters—the Holtzmans and Rosemary Dyer. He agreed with Ms. Dyer that the Board could reject the proposal outright and said that was a possibility. However, some of the other suggestions are not within the legal purview of the Board or workable in terms of practicality.

Addressing the idea of a 5-year bond that has been suggested, Mr. Cohen said the issue for him is how to compare past and future flooding events. “Is there documentation on record that people have that shows what happened in certain years, depending upon how much rain or snow fell?”

On the matter of water pressure booster pumps, Mr. Cohen asked Mr. Bernstein how much one costs. Receiving the answer of “around \$2,000”, Mr. Cohen suggested that the neighbors consider installing them. “Not to be unsympathetic, but if I had a significant problem with the water pressure in my home and the Town couldn’t do anything about it, that’s what I would do.”

As for the school impact, Mr. Cohen didn’t think there’d be much difference between a conventional and a cluster development. He agreed that the number of enrollments was likely to be higher than the developer’s calculation.

Mr. Cohen agreed that moving the new street away from the intersection is a safer plan. He also said, considering the downward sloping topography of the Fox Run parcel, the looming effect of larger conventional homes would be minimized if that model of subdivision was chosen.

Mr. Cohen said he is still struggling to reconcile the two different locations being developed. “The points that have been raised lend me to lean a little more favorably toward the standard subdivision, even with all the negatives that come with the lack of control the Board has. It seems like a positive way to address all the concerns about the neighborhood and the traffic as it pertains to the new roadway’s proximity to the Fox Run Road/Springs Road intersection.”

Mr. DeVellis said that, the neighbors' comments and concerns notwithstanding, the PRD plan is not so uncommon. "There are two separate entrances, the housing types are varied which is what you required." He compared the project to other developments, such as Bedfordshire, and he noted there would be an addition of two houses—one of them a 4-bedroom—to the affordable housing inventory. Mr. DeVellis listed the other benefits as well, such as the park, one or possibly two trail accesses, preservation of land in perpetuity, housing options for downsizers.

Mr. DeVellis emphasized that the school children calculations were not done to deceive. He used what he believed to be an accurate method to arrive at the figures submitted. He agreed to develop an alternative calculation.

Finally, Mr. DeVellis said he would be happy to work with the Madisons to agree on buffers to protect their sightlines.

Since the developer will meet again with Conservation on September 13th and the walk through with the Housing Partnership remains to be done, it was proposed that the Public Hearing be reopened on Tuesday, September 27. Mr. Cohen said he hoped that the documents could be submitted in time for adequate review before the meeting. Mr. DeVellis said that should be easier to do this time because there are fewer wholesale revisions.

Ms. Perry said it was possible the by-right plan shown this evening for 4 conventional houses off Fox Run was accurate but she had not been able yet to check the specifics. She added it was true, on the Buehler side, that there was not enough existing frontage for even one house so the road would need to be extended to create frontage. It may be possible to achieve two houses there with a conventional layout.

Motion: Ms. Lloyd moved to continue the Public Hearing until Tuesday, September 27th. Ms. Mustapich seconded. The motion passed, 5-0-0.

BUSINESS ITEMS:

- Introduction of New Planning Director to Board

Town Manager Rick Reed introduced new Planning Director Tony Fields to the Board. Mr. Fields has extensive experience in planning with 21 years, mostly as Director, in Burlington and 3 years as Director in Billerica. For the last year, Mr. Fields has been working with 4 different towns on "various interim needs". He brings with him knowledge of and a working relationship with the Middlesex3 Coalition. His first day in Bedford will be Tuesday, September 6th.

Mr. Reed expressed his appreciation for Assistant Planner Catherine Perry who has done an admirable job in the interim between Mr. Garber's departure and Mr. Fields' arrival.

- Signing for Evergreen Meadows PRD

The signing was postponed until documentation is in order.

- Review draft of minor Zoning Amendments for Special Fall Town Meeting (public hearing scheduled for Sept. 13)

Before discussing the amendments draft, Mr. Cohen reported that the Selectmen are considering placing a moratorium on medical marijuana dispensaries in town. This would require a Zoning Bylaw amendment. Town Counsel will draft language for the Selectmen's review and the Planning Board will be asked to hold a Public Hearing in October, sponsored by the Selectmen, with the goal of bringing the matter before Special Town Meeting for a vote in November.

About the amendments drafted by Ms. Perry, the Board remarked on their excellence and clarity and made several small changes. Ms. Perry will show the zoning amendments to Town Counsel and distribute the revised documents to the Board for the public hearing on September 13.

REPORTS/DEVELOPMENT UPDATES:

- Questions/Comments on 7-27-16 Development Update Chart

Looking at the table of upcoming development presentations, Ms. Hackman noted there appears to be a break in activity that could provide time to discuss the work program with the new Director present.

- Liaison Reports:

Ms. Mustapich said that the Municipal Housing Trust will meet in Executive Session next week to discuss the Coast Guard property.

Mr. Cohen said the Market Study Group will meet on August 31. Also, the consultants' proposals for the Great Road Zoning Project are due August 31.

MINUTES:

Ms. Mustapich moved to accept the minutes with minor corrections. Ms. Lloyd seconded. The motion passed, 5-0-0.

FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE:

Meetings were scheduled previously through October.
Subsequent meetings will be:

November 22
December 6
December 20 (if needed)
January 10
January 26

(Note: The December dates were changed after the meeting. Dates posted above are accurate.)

ADJOURNMENT: Ms. Hackman moved that to adjourn. Mr. Hanegan seconded. The motion passed, 5-0-0.

Respectfully submitted,
Kim Siebert, Recording Secretary