

BEDFORD PLANNING BOARD
Zoom Remote Meeting
Minutes
October 10, 2023

MEMBERS PRESENT: Christopher Gittins, Chair; Todd Crowley, Clerk; Amy Lloyd, Jacinda Barbehenn and Steven Hagan

STAFF PRESENT: Tony Fields, Planning Director; Catherine Perry, Assistant Planner; Amanda Hawkes, Administrative Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT: Pamela Brown, attorney for Bilca, LLC; Ali Khaledi, Bilca, LLC; Cynthia First, Bilca, LLC; Daniel Carr, engineer for Bilca, LLC; Jay Miller, landscape architect for Bilca, LLC; Alec Francesconi of 251 Old Billerica Road; Stephen Andres of 46 Mitchell Grant Way; Sue Baldauf of 37 Mitchell Grant Way; Matthew Mortenson, attorney for Emily Wade, 251B Old Billerica Road; Paul Laudano, attorney for Emily Wade, 251B Old Billerica Road; John McClain of 8 Maple Street

Chair Gittins called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm, cited the Remote Meeting Guidelines, stated that the meeting is being recorded and called the Roll of Board Members in attendance.

Chair Gittins summarized the agenda.

DEVELOPMENT SESSION

Public Hearing (continuation): 229, 251A and 251F Old Billerica Road – Residential Use Special Permit

Chair Gittins asked the applicants if outstanding questions and concerns would be answered in tonight's presentation. Attorney Pamela Brown stated they would like to receive final feedback tonight so they can move forward with finalizing the plans for the next meeting.

Chair Gittins asked if the Board has received comments from DPW. Planning Director Anthony Fields stated they did receive comments from DPW.

Member Lloyd asked for clarification on the Peer Review Report from Weston & Sampson in the package. Landscape Architect Jay Miller stated that the bolded text throughout the Peer Review is the design team's response. Chair Gittins added that Weston & Sampson has not yet sent additional comments to concur with the design team's response.

Chair Gittins stated there are multiple items noted on Mr. Fields' memo dated June 5, 2023 that are still unaddressed. Mr. Fields stated that a large item still unaddressed is the boundaries of the

Planning Board Minutes
101023

project are unconfirmed. He added that the plans now include a subdivision, and a subdivision application should be submitted so that Board can work with both applications concurrently.

Chair Gittins again asked the applicants if outstanding questions and concerns would be answered in tonight's presentation. Ms. Brown stated that they sent their response comments to Weston & Sampson in mid-September, however they did not receive it until last week. She added that the presentation tonight is updated plans as a result of the Select Board meeting, and while she does not expect a vote tonight, she hoped to present and receive final comments from the Board as they finalize plans.

Chair Gittins stated that to his understanding, the issue with abutters is still open. He added that the need for a boundary is still unaddressed, as well as multiple items in Mr. Fields' June 5th memo.

Member Lloyd stated the detention basin that belongs to the PRD that is in a single-family lot has still been unaddressed, and is not a typical way property boundaries are defined.

Member Barbehenn stated that until the logistics and legal pieces are worked out with the syndicate about the land, she does not feel they should listen to anything else regarding the project.

Chair Gittins asked for a motion to reopen the public hearing. No motion was given.

Chair Gittins asked if there is a request for a continuance. Ms. Brown requested a continuation to the next Planning Board Meeting. Chair Gittins stated the next available meeting for the public hearing is November 14, 2023.

MOTION: Member Barbehenn proposed and Member Crowley seconded, to continue the public hearing to the November 14th meeting

VOTE: By Roll Call:

Christopher Gittins	Aye
Todd Crowley	Aye
Amy Lloyd	Aye
Steven Hagan	Aye
Jacinda Barbehenn	Aye

BUSINESS SESSION

MBTA Communities Multifamily Zoning

Chair Gittins stated that he and Member Barbehenn have been working as a subcommittee and have prepared a presentation.

Member Barbehenn shared her screen to show a spreadsheet of the engagement work plan the subcommittee has created. Member Barbehenn explained the spreadsheet, highlighting various dates of importance. She stated the All Town Survey the Board prepared for Bedford Day will be open until October 27th. She added they discussed mailing the survey to residents in town and asked for staff support with asking for funds and executing on mailings by the beginning of next week.

Member Barbehenn shared the subcommittee's plan for engagement over the next month, stating that they have reached out to the following groups to present: Transportation Advisory Committee, Board of Health, School Committee, Financial Committee, Bedford Family Connection, the Library, Bedford TV, Chamber of Commerce, and the Select Board.

Member Lloyd asked what specifically they are telling the various groups. Member Barbehenn stated they are using the pamphlet they created for Bedford Day, and the presentation will focus on what are the MBTA Guidelines and what does Bedford have to do to comply, followed by a Q&A. She added that they will also introduce the idea that the Planning Board will create three maps to showcase at the Fall Special Town Meeting to gain input from residents.

Member Barbehenn stated that any Board members are able to attend these various meetings as they wish, however to keep it Open Meeting Law compliant, she asked members to reach out to her with a request to join a meeting so the subcommittee can coordinate who can attend what.

Assistant Planning Director Catherine Perry asked for clarification on how long the survey will be open for, as she has heard conflicting dates. Member Barbehenn confirmed it will be open until October 27th.

Member Barbehenn continued explaining the engagement spreadsheet. She stated that one of the questions in the survey is about participating in a focus group, and about 1/3 of the people who have responded to the survey have shown interest. She stated their plan is to reach out to the focus group November 4th and include a second survey designed specifically for the focus group, and then hold a meeting on November 16th to discuss the three map options.

Member Barbehenn stated that for the second half of November, the engagement efforts will shift to general engagement, where a meeting will be held that the whole town is invited to on

Planning Board Minutes
101023

November 30th. She stated the during December, the Board should have the districts finalized and warrant articles drafted, followed by the Public Hearing process in January and another round of outreach and engagement before Spring Town Meeting.

Ms. Perry suggested they could post notices on public bulletins around town. Member Barbehenn agreed with the idea.

Member Lloyd asked for clarification on what the focus group will be doing. She asked if it would be better to obtain a larger amount of opinions through community engagement rather than create a small focus group before hosting community engagement. Member Barbehenn stated that because the survey asked about a focus group and there has been interest, she would like to move forward with the focus group. She added that those who have provided an email to be part of the focus group may be more motivated to participate on a deeper level than those who come to an all town meeting, and it will create a meaningful dialogue with residents.

Chair Gittins stated that getting feedback early on from folks who have identified they are interested may have more of an effect on shaping what is presented to a broader audience.

Member Lloyd asked if they should have the focus group and the larger engagement more spread out from each other. Member Barbehenn stated the main factor is the tight timeline they have to work with.

Member Hagan stated that he endorses the focus group, stating that there are two all town meetings per year and unless there is a controversial topic, they do not see a large turnout.

Chair Gittins called for final questions and comments before turning the conversation over to discuss maps. No further questions or comments from the Board.

Ms. Perry stated that the first suggestion from the Board was to use the RKG map using the densest area highlighted minus the historic district. She stated that when her and Mr. Fields looked into the area, it would be a much larger area than what the Board is searching for. She added that Mr. Fields has been working on a map that focuses on the roads north and south of The Great Road, and the area east of the Town Campus rather than the entire center.

Chair Gittins shared his screen to show the RKG map. He stated it is still unclear from the State whether or not the historic districts can be included in the MBTA Communities zoning. Ms. Perry stated she believes it may be allowed to be included.

Mr. Fields shared his screen to show the map he created. The map includes the neighborhood north of The Great Road; between Springs Road, Pine Hill Road, North Road and The Great

Planning Board Minutes
101023

Road, excluding historic buildings, and is approximately the 50 acres needed to fulfill the MBTA Communities requirement. He stated that because some of this includes resident district C, there is a question of if certain lots could be expanded on.

Chair Gittins asked if the Board would need to change the minimum lot size in that district so that the lots are conforming, or if they could have a statement in the overlay stating that multifamily would be allowed by-right independent of lot size. Mr. Fields stated they would grant those rules in the overlay as a by-right. Ms. Perry added that they could also include a different minimum lot size in the overlay, or change the minimum lot size in that district entirely if they wanted to go about it that way.

Member Crowley asked what the Board would like to do for minimum lot sizes with the overlay district, and also asked if non-conforming versus conforming will matter for this requirement and if height will matter. Ms. Perry stated they would most likely translate the height limits into stories, suggesting three stories.

Member Crowley stated that three stories is higher than the current height limit across Bedford for single family homes. He asked if this will have to be by-right, even on a non-conforming lot, allowing multifamily units to be built to the lot boundaries, with no say from any Board or Committee.

Mr. Fields stated that in order to comply with the MBTA Communities guidelines, the process for constructing multifamily units will need to be entirely by-right. He added that the Board can identify certain setback requirements and keep the current 35-foot height limit.

Member Crowley stated that today, many of the lots are non-conforming and would need to go in front of the ZBA to do a tear down, but multifamily would be allowed by-right.

Chair Gittins stated that the requirement is they need to allow for 15 units per acre. Member Crowley stated that they currently do not allow for single family houses to be torn down and rebuilt on a lot of lots due to the lots being non-conforming, but they will now be allowing multifamily to be built by-right regardless of if a lot is non-conforming.

Mr. Fields commented that Member Crowley is making the point that if this area were designated as part of the MBTA Communities, the pathway to build multifamily becomes much easier than replacing a single-family house. Member Crowley stated while he agrees, most of Bedford is non-conforming so his statement applies to more than just this area.

Member Lloyd asked if Chair Gittins could share the RKG map on screen again. Looking at the RKG map, she stated she does not believe this is a map the Board should use as one of the three

Planning Board Minutes
101023

maps to present at Fall Town Meeting. She stated that this is a general map that is not specific to all of Bedford, and they are looking for what is best for Bedford and not looking for what RKG thinks is generally good for all towns. She added that this map marks the center of town as “excellent” but marks the Shawsheen district as “good”, while the Shawsheen district has larger lot sizes, more empty lots or lots with older buildings that are harder to maintain, and is right on the MBTA line.

Member Lloyd stated that the neighborhood north of The Great Road has small, single family, affordable houses compared to the rest of town. She questioned why the Board would want to get rid of a more affordable area of town for single families, and added that she does not believe it would go over well with voters if that area was presented as an option.

Member Crowley stated Member Lloyd brought up great points, adding that the criteria used by RKG is useful but does not consider a lot of other aspects of Bedford.

Ms. Perry stated that there is a two-page list of criteria used by RKG. Member Barbehenn added it does include the floodplains, which may be why the Shawsheen area was considered “good” instead of “excellent”.

Member Barbehenn asked if staff could provide a definition of resident district C and resident district B.

Mr. Fields stated that resident district C requires a minimum lot area of 25,000 square ft and a minimum frontage of 115 ft, where resident district B requires a minimum lot area of 30,000 square ft and a minimum frontage of 125 ft. He stated that the majority of the lots in the town center, whether they are resident B or C, are non-conforming to those criteria.

Member Barbehenn stated that in the map created by Mr. Fields, those lots are resident district C and asked about the area to the east. Mr. Fields stated that to the east of Spring Road and the bike path is resident district B.

Member Lloyd stated that she agrees that a variety of multifamily, include small multifamily likes fourplexes, are very desirable to have, however she does not think having a four-family home on a 9,000 square foot lot is feasible.

Chair Gittins asked Member Lloyd to elaborate. Member Lloyd stated it would need to take up the entire lot, and many community members may take objection to that. She added that she does not think each unit would be large enough for family housing, and therefore the Board would not be addressing the needs that have to be addressed.

Planning Board Minutes
101023

Chair Gittins asked what type of multifamily housing would work in Bedford, and shared his screen to show the information pamphlet handed out at Bedford Day which highlights various types of multifamily housing. Member Lloyd clarified that she does think many of those options would work in Bedford, just not that the neighborhood highlighted on the map by Mr. Fields. She added that down Loomis Street and into the Depot area may be a good area for something like fourplexes, and Shawsheen may be a good area for larger developments and maybe townhouses.

Chair Gittins stated the Board will not be specifying in that level of detail in the zoning. Chair Gittins questioned if the Board should look at smaller lots to support gentle density or larger lots to support greater density.

Member Lloyd stated that she does not believe is it a question of gentle density, but a question of the impact a multifamily development would have in a given area. As an example, Member Lloyd stated that if something was built on the Stop and Shop plaza that accommodates a number of units, it would have less of an impact than if a small one-story home on a 9,000 square foot lot were torn down and replaced with a two and a half-story four-family home that touches all four lot setbacks.

Chair Gittins asked Member Lloyd to elaborate. Member Lloyd stated it would be a much larger structure with many more people added right on top of neighbors who are also on small lots.

Member Barbehenn added that she thinks there should be a combination of both types of developments. She pushed back on Member Lloyd's point, stating that it does not make sense to say a large apartment complex above Stop and Shop would have adequate unit sizes for families but a small apartment complex in a neighborhood would not. Member Lloyd stated that she does not believe a 9,000 square ft lot is big enough to create four units that are the appropriate size for families. Member Barbehenn stated that the size of a family unit would be the same regardless of if it is in a small apartment complex or a large apartment complex.

Member Barbehenn stated that the Board needs to consider what effect these different developments could have, who they will effect, when they will effect, and how they will effect. She stated that in these two scenarios being discussed, one is an incremental change over the course of 30 years in a gentle density situation, where as properties turn over they will change one at a time; the other would be one massive shock to the town with a lot of people all at once. Member Barbehenn added she thinks they should do both, they just need to be prepared.

Member Lloyd stated that she is not against the smaller units, she just does not think that specific neighborhood north of The Great Road is the right location to consider. Member Barbehenn added that maybe they should wait to discuss each option for districting before they start deeply

discussing pros and cons of each area.

Chair Gittins shared his screen to show the RKG map of Bedford, asking Member Lloyd which areas she will consider when drafting a map. Member Lloyd stated she is interested in the area around Shawsheen, down Loomis, and on Middlesex Turnpike with other zoning or incentives to create a more walkable and cohesive neighborhood.

Member Hagan stated that talking about Middlesex Turnpike brings the Woburn Sportsmen's Association into question. He asked if she thinks rezoning the club property for housing would pass town meeting, and stated that if she does not think it would pass town meeting then they should not be discussing it, but if she does think it would pass town meeting to explain. Member Hagan extended the question to the rest of the Board, stating that if a majority of the Board does not think it would pass town meeting, they should stop discussing it.

Chair Gittins stated that he is unsure of whether Middlesex Turnpike would be more or less favorable to voters than other areas. He stated the he feels lukewarm to Middlesex Turnpike, adding he is not a hard no, but is much more favorable towards other areas shown on the RKG map.

Member Hagan stated he feels that there will be at least 200 voters who will vote no on rezoning the area of the club, and added that this is the Board's only shot to create something they feel voters will vote in favor of. Chair Gittins stated that while it is the undesirable option, they could hold a Special Town Meeting focused on passing the zoning changes if needed.

Member Crowley stated he feels presenting Middlesex Turnpike as an option at Fall Town Meeting is not a bad thing, so they can gather feedback to know if there is a true majority against it or not. He then stated that he does not love the idea of the red area highlighted on the RKG map. He stated there are a lot of half acre lots throughout the town center and surrounding neighborhoods, and if by-right it is easier to put seven units on a half-acre lot than it is to build a single-family home, then he struggles with this concept.

Member Lloyd asked for other objections to the Middlesex Turnpike area, stating that it is on two bus routes, it is near a desirable shopping area, and it is near highways. She stated that if it were rezoned to allow for housing, it would be entirely up to the owners of the Woburn Sportsmen's Association if it were to be developed, but if it were to be developed the zoning could be worded so that it is done correctly. She added that she is curious why some members are focused on the center of town, when the center is what so many voters are against changing due to preserving the character of Bedford.

Member Barbehenn stated that one of her reasons for wanting to focus on the center of town is

Planning Board Minutes
101023

the financial implications of what they are doing in regards to the taxpayers. She stated that the more they distribute the population to the furthest reaches of town, the more costs taxpayers will incur on an annual basis in regards to infrastructure, creation and maintenance, and service providing. She added that while the town is considering the location for a new fire station, one of the requirements is having equal timing to get to each part of town, and adding 700 units to the furthest side of Bedford at Middlesex Turnpike would add more weight to the equation. She also added that a common complaint made by residents of the town is that there is a lack of businesses and restaurants within the town, and by creating a larger population in the center of town, the demand for new businesses and restaurants would increase and they would see the ability for independent businesses to thrive in town.

Chair Gittins stated that his reasoning overlaps with Member Barbehenn's. He stated that he favors the idea of incremental changes, and believes that areas with smaller lots would be developed slowly over a generation. He added that along the area of The Great Road with a critical mass of commercial and residential, more residential will help keep business vital. He stated he agrees with Member Barbehenn's comments about infrastructure, and would be curious to hear from DPW as to where capacity is present versus where substantial upgrades would need to be made to support water, sewer and electrical.

Member Barbehenn added that the idea is to create walkable communities to cut down on the amount of car trips taken in town.

Chair Gittins stated he can imagine an east Bedford neighborhood developing, but it may be a heavier lift than allowing the center to develop.

Ms. Perry stated that she was unable to find more information about how RKG weighs the criteria when creating maps, and added that it seems the map they created is focuses heavily on a central point rather than along the entire Great Road corridor.

Chair Gittins shared his screen and introduced a discussion of the application for the Mass Housing Partnership Technical Assistance Grant, and the Board walked through part of the application together with staff. The Board requested five out of six types of technical assistant, which include locating and delineating districts, developing and modifying use and intensity requirements, calculating capacity and gross density requirements, drafting zoning amendments, and community engagement and education.

Ms. Perry suggested that within the application, they stress the tight timeline due to the Bedford Annual Town Meeting happening earlier than surrounding towns.

Chair Gittins introduced a discussion on candidate maps to have prepared for the next Planning

Planning Board Minutes

101023

Board meeting.

Ms. Perry noted that included in tonight's Planning Board Package are maps from previous work staff has done regarding Shawsheen and the Market Place districts. She stated she has begun looking into how the flood plain will affect MBTA Communities, and she is hoping to receive clarity from the State soon. She added that if both the Shawsheen and Market Place districts were included, they would be over to 50 acres required.

Member Barbehenn asked if staff can continue to work in the background on how the flood plains will affect MBTA Communities while the Board works on deciding what area to rezone.

Member Hagan agreed, stated he would like to hear more about the flood plains from Ms. Perry. He added that when conversations are started around town about adding more housing, the Stop and Shop plaza always comes up as a suggestion and he would like to have as much information on the area as possible.

Chair Gittins stated he would like to see three maps created for the next Planning Board meeting, and one should be a combination of Shawsheen and the Market Place. He asked if staff could also include any changes they would need to make to the by-laws in order to make a zoning change in those areas happen. He stated he would still like to see a Town Center based map as an option to discuss, Member Barbehenn agreed.

Chair Gittins stated he could sketch a map for a Town Center option.

Member Lloyd stated she could sketch a map for the area of Loomis Street and the Depot.

Member Barbehenn stated she likes having three maps to begin the discussion with, but that she believes she will want to use a combination of all three options as they all use different strategies. She added that she does not want the Board to feel limited to the 50 acre requirement, stating that if they create a compromise that combines all three options, they should not limit it to the 50 acres if it covers more than the requirement.

Member Crowley stated that he agrees with Member Barbehenn, but doesn't know how far over 50 acres it should go.

Member Barbehenn stated that if they zone the Shawsheen and Market Place districts and fulfill the 50 acres with just those areas, she fears that the Town will see a shock change much quicker than if the center was rezoned and there was gentle development over time.

Member Lloyd stated that a lot of the buildings in the Shawsheen district are older buildings

reaching the end of their viable lives. She stated that as people start to think about selling or replacing these buildings, they could miss a chance at creating more housing if they do not rezone it to be included with MBTA Communities. Member Barbehenn added that while she does not disagree, that area is already zoned for mixed-use.

Member Hagan stated that Member Lloyd and Member Barbehenn have made reasonable points, and asked if the Board should consider zoning 55 or 60 acres so that they can blend these areas together and are not constricting the by-right development.

The Board agreed that Chair Gittins, Member Lloyd, and Member Barbehenn will create maps to present at the next Planning Board meetings.

Member Lloyd stated that she has heard a common argument against MBTA Communities that the Town deny the guidelines and give up state grants. She stated that it is not a simple matter of deciding to accept guidelines or not, but that it is a law that needs to be complied with and that may not be clear to the general public. She added that when the Board begins to host community engagement and education, they need to be clear from the beginning that this is a law we need to comply with.

Member Crowley stated that they have not discussed the area west and north of Carlisle Road that is highlighted “excellent” and “good” on the RKG map, and asked if there is a viable space there. Mr. Fields stated that they have not run that area through the model, but they can and get the Board data. He added that the reason they have not run this area is because it is beyond the bus route. Ms. Perry added that the historic district also runs through the North Road business district.

The Board took a 5-minute recess, beginning at 9pm to return at 9:05pm with Liaison Reports.

Board Liaison Reports

Member Lloyd had nothing relevant to report.

Member Hagan reported he had nothing relevant to report, however he did want to call attention to the tree policy being presented by BARC at the Fall Town Meeting. He stated that within this policy, deciding what the fees are for removal of a public tree would be regulated by BARC, which would not need approval at Town Meetings. He added that public trees removed by the town would be paid for by taxpayers.

Member Barbehenn had nothing relevant to report.

Member Crowley had nothing relevant to report.

Chair Gittins reported that Energy and Sustainability will meet next on October 18th.

Staff Updates/Development Update

Mr. Fields reported that he attended the Southern New England American Planning Association Conference last Thursday and Friday. He stated that it is a group of Connecticut, Rhode Island and Massachusetts planners and was a good learning experience to see what others are doing with various planning topics.

Ms. Perry reported that she finalized the Annual Report and has posted it on the Planning webpage, as well as sent to the Town Managers staff.

Member Barbehenn asked for an update on the by-law rewriting. Ms. Perry stated she has sent an email to the consultants for a status update. Member Barbehenn asked if there is a timeline for the contract. Ms. Perry stated it has gone slowly, but it may have to do with staffing of the consultants. She added that it is targeted for the Spring Town Meeting. Mr. Fields added that the consultants have gone through some personnel changes, and they are the most in demand consultant group.

Chair Gittins asked what payments have been made to the consultants. Mr. Fields stated that less than half of the contract has been paid at this point.

Member Barbehenn asked what work there is to show for what has been paid to this point. Mr. Fields stated he believes that more than half of the scope of the contract has been fulfilled at this point.

Chair Gittins asked for an update on the 310 Great Road project. Mr. Fields stated that the Code Enforcement director has reported seeing a handful of employees working on the site. Chair Gittins stated the project appears weathered and does not look well maintained, and added that he brought this up to question how to respond if the same developers present another application for another project in town. Mr. Fields stated that technically, the Board is not allowed to deny applications based on the track record of the developer.

Minutes

The board received the minutes of its September 26 meeting.

Member Lloyd offered edits to page 3.

Planning Board Minutes
101023

MOTION: Member Barbehenn proposed and Member Lloyd seconded, to approve the minutes with edits

VOTE: By Roll Call:

Christopher Gittins	Aye
Amy Lloyd	Aye
Jacinda Barbehenn	Aye
Todd Crowley	Aye
Steven Hagan	Aye

Adjournment

MOTION: Member Hagan proposed and Member Lloyd seconded, to adjourn at 9:25pm

VOTE: By Roll Call:

Christopher Gittins	Aye
Amy Lloyd	Aye
Jacinda Barbehenn	Aye
Todd Crowley	Aye
Steven Hagan	Aye

Minutes prepared by Amanda Hawkes

DOCUMENT LIST

Agenda

Briefing memo dated October 6, 2023 from Planning Director D. Anthony Fields, for Planning Board meeting

Memo dated October 7, 2023 from Chair Christopher Gittins to the Planning Board regarding protocol for public hearings

Parliamentary Procedure for Meetings

Roberts Rules of Order – Simplified

Planning Board Minutes
101023

Old Billerica Road- Comments from Department of Public Works dated October 6, 2023

Old Billerica Road- 5-page landscape plan

Old Billerica Road- 11-page response to “Stormwater Permit Peer Review from Weston & Sampson dated June 22, 2023”, by Stamski and McNary, INC. dated September 13, 2023.

February 2023 Town District Maps

Bedford Map of Excluded Land

Article titled “No silver bullets in housing crisis” by Jennifer Smith at Commonwealth Magazine dated September 11, 2023

Bedford Red-Lined Base Maps

Article titled “The Boston suburbs’ cynical ploy to keep poor families out: Use seniors as a shield” by The Editorial Board dated October 1, 2023

Bedford Town Center Base Map 1

Bedford Town Center Base Map 2

Article titled “Why Newton’s zoning plan is so controversial — and needed” by Greg Reibman at Commonwealth Magazine dated September 28, 2023

Article titled “Billionaires are responsible for large amounts of climate pollution from Hanscom, a new report finds” by David Abel at the Globe dated October 3, 2023

Hanscom High Flyers Report Summary dated October 2023

Article titled “Massport’s plan to expand private jet space at Hanscom is a climate debacle” by Scot Lehigh at the Globe dated September 29, 2023

29-page Hanscom High Flyers Report dated October 2023

Development Updated dated October 4, 2023

Draft minutes from Planning Board meeting September 26, 2023

Final 2023 Special Town Meeting Warrant

Various press articles on topics of planning interest