

**BEDFORD PLANNING BOARD**  
**Zoom Remote Meeting**  
**Minutes**  
**October 24, 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:** Shawn Hanegan, Select Board liaison; Emily Mitchell, Select Board; Pamela Brown, Brown & Brown; Brian Navarro, Greylock Partners; David Faulkner, 5 Pine Street; Joseph Piantedosi, 14 Putnam Road; Nicholas Howard, 7 Daniels Drive; Robin Steele, 7 Jeffrey Circle; Cameron Heller, 330 Old Billerica Road; Rich \_\_\_\_\_

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.

**BUSINESS SESSION**

**100 Plank Street**

Planning Director Anthony Fields stated that this discussion is in regards to Greylock Partners looking to gauge the Board's willingness to entertain an amendment to the special permit. He stated that the latest iteration of the special permit is for this project to be 52 units of housing with 6,000 square feet of commercial office, but the mixed-use portions of this development over the years have been challenging to market. He stated that in their last discussion of 100 Plank Street, Attorney Pamela Brown and her client Brian Navarro showed the Board a concept that would change most of the 6,000 square feet of office space into dwelling units. He added that tonight they will present an updated presentation and the Board can determine if they would be in favor of an amendment to the special permit.

Assistant Planning Director Catherine Perry stated she believes the Board has not looked into the zoning bylaws. She stated under the Industrial Mixed-Use bylaw that was in place when the original special permit was granted, the current office space is below the normal requirement and the current residential space is above the normal maximum floor area ratio. She added that this includes the Taylor Pond property, as they were combined projects when the special permit was granted. She stated that when this was last discussed in 2012-2013, the Board of that time was discussing what would be the minimum office space they could include to still qualify as mixed-use, and that Board decided on the 6,000 square feet. She added a reminder that housing-only

developments were not, and are not, allowed in this location.

Member Crowley asked for further background. Ms. Perry stated that in 2014, the Industrial Mixed-Use bylaw was completely rewritten, and no longer allows housing in mixed-use developments. She stated that the old bylaw set a minimum 5% floor area ratio for commercial space, and a maximum 35% floor area ratio for the housing units. She added that the Board at the time had to allow waivers for those two measures for this development.

Member Crowley asked if Taylor Pond still has any commercial elements. Ms. Perry stated that there was mention of a small office space, but it may be referring to the leasing office which is not counted as a separate use. Member Crowley asked what the first floor at Taylor Pond is now being used for. Ms. Perry stated that two of the buildings at Taylor Pond originally had first floors dedicated to retail space, but due to never being occupied, the Board at the time allowed the conversion of the retail space into 12 more housing units.

Chair Gittins asked for any further questions before Ms. Brown proceeds. There were no further questions.

Ms. Brown agreed that there is a long history of change with these projects. She stated that at Taylor Pond, the only remaining commercial space is the leasing office and a residential amenity space. She stated that 100 Plank Street was originally part of the Taylor Pond site and was subdivided out, however both sites are still subject to the original special permit as amended. She agreed with Ms. Perry that the Board at the time granted waivers, however she stated the bylaw has a clause which may allow for more multi-family housing. She added that they are aware and appreciate that the original goal was to have a mixed-use development, but she asked the Board to look at the neighborhood of the site and noted they have struggled to fill commercial spaces at this site.

Ms. Brown shared her screen to show the Board three variations of proposed floor plans to replace the commercial space. The first variation, which she noted is the most desired variation, converts the entire commercial space into residential space, with six one-bedroom units. The second variation converts the entire commercial space into residential space, but with two two-bedroom units and three one-bedroom units. The third variation converts most of the commercial space into residential space, with five one-bedroom units, and leaves 726 square feet of office space to ideally be leased to a single tenant.

Ms. Brown showed the Board the floor plans of the existing residential units on the other portion of the first floor, stating that for the affordable units to count with the state, they will need to be scattered throughout the building. She stated that her client is willing to make 100% of the proposed units affordable, and noted that to count with the state, they will need to increase the

total number of affordable units throughout the building rather than make the additional units all affordable.

Member Crowley asked if the building plan being shown highlights new affordable units or existing affordable units. Ms. Brown stated this highlights the existing 13 affordable units, and that they will add the additional affordable units throughout the building for a total of 18 or 19, depending on which floor plan the Board agrees to.

Chair Gittins asked for further questions before moving on to Board discussion. No further questions.

Chair Gittins stated there are two questions that need to be answered tonight; is what's being proposed legal, and it what's being proposed good. Chair Gittins opened up discussion of the Board.

Member Hagan asked how the Board decides if this is legal. Chair Gittins clarified that the Board will hear from Town Counsel if this is legal, and take it into advisement with their discussion. He stated that if this proposal is declared not legal, the conversation is done, but if this proposal is declared legal, they are able to proceed with a discussion.

Member Lloyd stated that after giving this proposal thought, she is not in favor of it. She stated that this project has been given so many waivers that it hardly adheres to the original bylaw. She added that she is not willing to go further with this, and noted that the five or six new units do not add a new type of housing and are not designed for families. She stated they could look into other types of paid amenities for tenants, other types of retail, or small workspace style offices.

Member Crowley stated that coming from the Zoning Board of Appeals, his perspective is his experience with Town Counsel has been mixed in terms of assistance. He stated he is not sure how much the Board is supposed to interpret the bylaws, but he is in support of this proposal. He stated this area already has a lot of residential and this proposal fits in with the area, the town needs more units available, and the town needs more affordable units. He added he sees a lot of positives with this proposal, and if Town Counsel declares this is a legal proposal, he believes that this proposal is the right thing for the Town.

Chair Gittins stated that Town Counsel did concur that this proposal is inconsistent with the intent of the bylaw, but if there was an application to amend the Special Permit and it was approved without appeal, it would likely stand. Mr. Fields stated that they will not get a black and white answer but rather a gray answer. He stated that a 2010 opinion from prior Town Counsel said the floor area ratio elements as part of the bylaw are dimensional criteria, and are designed so that the Board can consider waiving those requirements as part of the special permit.

Member Barbehenn stated they should focus on the intent of what the original Planning Board had in mind, which was that this would be a mixed-use project. She stated that with Taylor Pond, the office space was vacant for a few years while they tried to lease the space before they requested a change to residential. She stated she would like to see the same with 100 Plank Street, and would prefer they give the original mixed-use intent a chance.

Member Crowley stated he struggles with the statement of the intent of the original Board, and stated he believes they should focus on what the area looks like today and the impacts to commercial space from the pandemic. He stated things have changed in town, the housing needs are higher in town than now than when this project was originally presented, and he would like to look to the future of Bedford rather than focus entirely on the past intent of this project. He added that they have already failed for years trying to fill commercial space at Taylor Pond, and he would be curious to know the percentage of vacant office and retail space in Bedford.

Member Lloyd agreed with Member Barbehenn's point, and stated that while she understands the desire to look at how town is now, that is not how zoning considerations work in town. She agreed with some of Member Crowley's points about market changes post pandemic and the issues with vacancies around town, but stated that once something is made residential, it will never be available as anything other than residential. She added that by preserving some of the mixed-use intent, it could give residents a better experience rather than creating residential deserts that they are trying to avoid creating in town.

Member Barbehenn reinforced what Member Lloyd stating, adding they need to consider the framing. She stated that as the Planning Board, they are focused on the long-term goals of the town. She stated that they need a consistent stance on planning around town, and she believes they should stick to the vision that the previous Board had for Middlesex Turnpike, which was to create a mixed-use neighborhood.

Member Crowley stated he believes Town Counsel gave them guidance for this area that allows it to be a legal proposal, so he does not feel they would be relaxing requirements but rather following the special permit process. He stated when he thinks of mixed-use, he thinks of visibility, and he does not view Taylor Pond or Plank Street as areas with good visibility. He added that the Board has been discussing for months the need for more housing, and he believes this is a way to get more housing and more affordable housing.

Member Hagan stated he agrees with Member Crowley on this matter, and added that with long running projects, scar tissue can build up that is hard to let go of. He stated that the state has mandated that they override their zoning to create more housing, and if this project turns into a housing only project, then it is aligning with what the state is mandating.

Member Lloyd clarified that the previous Board was very in favor of mixed-use, and Taylor Pond was envisioned as a mixed-use project. She agreed that visibility is low at this location, but that there are other options other than retail for mixed-use.

Member Barbehenn stated that going off of Member Hagan's comment, the MBTA Communities requirement excludes mixed-use, which makes her feel that they need to preserve mixed-use opportunities where they can. She added that this spot is not going to qualify for their MBTA Communities compliance, therefore they should preserve it as mixed-use. She stated that to Member Crowley's point, the Planning Board has always focused on the long-term goals of the town and zoning changes cannot please everyone. She added that they should not be spending this much time on this project tonight, as they have identified larger problems to work on.

Ms. Perry stated that Town Counsel was clear that the Board does not have the power to approve a housing-only development. She added that they discussed what the minimum percentage of use would be to keep the project mixed-use, and Town Counsel recommended that the Board stick to the 6,000 square feet, however that is still a gray area.

Member Hagan stated he still has the same question from earlier, of how this Board is going to determine what is legal. He stated that what staff has articulated sounds like this proposed change is not legal, and questioned why they are having this long of a discussion on it and how this was allowed to come up.

Ms. Brown shared her screen to show the GSI map of the neighborhood. She discussed the history of the neighborhood with past projects and decisions by previous Planning Boards.

Chair Gittins called for order. Ms. Brown continued her statement. Chair Gittins stated that Ms. Brown is out of order. Ms. Brown continued her statement. Chair Gittins requested that Ms. Brown be muted. Mr. Fields muted Ms. Brown.

Chair Gittins opened Public Comment due to a hand raised in the audience.

Nicholas Howard of 7 Daniels Drive stated that when interpreting the bylaw, the bylaw is an accumulation of things that passed Town Meeting. He stated that something like this was passed by Town Meeting because they don't want just more housing. He stated that this is already an industrial area, and allowing mixed-use is a way to add more housing in a controlled manner and attempt to cut down at the amount of trips people are going to be making into and out of town. He added that relaxing away from mixed-use would get away from the compromise that passed Town Meeting.

Chair Gittins stated he was under the impression that they could entertain the housing-only proposal until Ms. Perry offered her statement, and he now believes it is not allowed. Ms. Perry stated that is how she understands it.

Member Crowley clarified that one of the proposals did include a mixed-use office space. Chair Gittins agreed that the Board could allow a plan with one unit of office space.

Chair Gittins stated that looking at the comments from Town Counsel, the gray area appears to allow them to potentially approve an amendment to the Special Permit. He added that it does seem like the proposal that includes an office space would be allowable. He stated that it could be appealed, so there is no guarantee that it would go through, but added the housing-only options are not on the table.

Chair Gittins stated that the question now is if what is proposed is good. He stated he sees the need for housing, and would be supportive of an option which included more housing in the event that it is allowable within the bylaw. He stated that the mixed-use possibilities at this development are far less than they use to be, and added he does not see a benefit to preserving the first floor for commercial or office space over housing.

Chair Gittins took a straw poll to see if the Board members would support a proposal with a minimum requirement of office space with additional housing units. Chair Gittins, Member Hagan, and Member Crowley would support. Member Barbehenn and Member Lloyd would not support.

Chair Gittins asked staff if the applicant would need a majority or a super majority to pass an amendment to the Special Permit. Mr. Fields stated that his interpretation of the changes made with the Housing Choice Bill is that a majority is all the applicant would need.

Chair Gittins stated that there is a majority in support of a housing-oriented proposal, however that would require an amendment to the Special Permit, which could be appealed.

Member Lloyd asked if the proposal that they are in support of would still see all five units become affordable. Chair Gittins stated it is his understanding that any amount of additional housing allowed would translate to affordable.

Ms. Brown clarified that all five units, or any additional units allowed, would be added to the total number of affordable units throughout the building. Ms. Brown added that she believes the Board needs to decide if this would be considered a minor change, which would then not trigger an amendment to the special Permit.

Member Barbehenn stated that it does not seem like there is a reason why there can't be two two-bedroom units rather than four one-bedroom units, and added she would like to take that into consideration if they are going to continue discussing an amendment.

Ms. Brown stated that her client would not favor adding the two-bedroom units, but would be willing to if that is what the Board would support. She stated that she believes that plan would be able to include two two-bedroom units, two one-bedroom units, and the office.

Mr. Navarro stated that having all one-bedroom units in this space would be preferable, but he is willing to do two two-bedroom units if that is what the Board would like to see.

Ms. Brown shared her screen to show the proposed plan that includes both residential units and commercial office space. She stated they can adjust the plan to be four residential units, two two-bedrooms and two one-bedrooms, with remaining office space.

Chair Gittins asked staff if they should decide tonight if this would be a minor or major modification, or if that should be a discussion for another night. Mr. Fields stated that there may be a section related to modification in the pertinent bylaw. Ms. Brown shared her screen to show the bylaw.

Mr. Fields stated it would be within the Boards ability to determine now if they believe this is a minor or major amendment. Ms. Brown noted that the proposed change is a change of 2% in the grand scheme of the original permit.

Ms. Perry suggested that the Board not just focus on the size of the change when deciding if this is a minor or major change. She stated that the Board should also look at the principle of the change, and added that given the controversy of this project in the past, they may want to consider giving the public a chance to appeal. She stated she would be inclined to treat this as a major amendment.

Ms. Brown stated that during all the public hearings, no members of the public have come or shown opposition. Ms. Perry stated that the history of this project has been controversial, especially with the addition of more housing, and added that they have received push back and comments from people who were unable to attend meetings.

Chair Gittins asked for a show of hands from Board members on who would call this a minor or major amendment. Member Crowley and Member Hagan raised their hands for minor, Member Lloyd raised her hand for major, Chair Gittins stated he is leaning towards major, and Member Barbehenn abstained.

Chair Gittins stated he is inclined to call this a major amendment because there was not a clear majority for minor amendment and he sees potential for some controversy.

Member Hagan stated that he would like to echo the comment that they have not had a lot of public turnout to the public hearings on this project, and asked if anybody would be willing to spend the money to take the project to court if that is how the appeal process would work. He restated he will vote for this to be called a minor amendment.

Mr. Fields stated an appeal would go to land court, although superior court is an option. He stated that if this is a minor amendment, an appeal would need to wait until the building permit is amended.

Chair Gittins stated he is now leaning towards a minor amendment. Mr. Fields noted that a minor amendment would not trigger a public hearing, which would in turn not trigger the 20-day appeal period. He stated that if somebody wanted to appeal, they would need to appeal the building permit and not the amendment.

Member Lloyd stated that the appeal period is not the only consideration to be made. She added that it is a significant change in usage and while yes there is office space, it is a small amount and the real usage of the building will be residential.

Member Barbehenn stated that given the comments made, she believes it should be a major amendment. She echoed Member Lloyd's point, stating this would be a huge change to the usage.

Chair Gittins stated he believes the major changes happened a long time ago, and the current proposal is a relatively minor change in the scope of the current project. He added that in the scope of what was originally envisioned, it is a major change. He stated that he has mixed feelings due to the change switching from minor to major when looking at it from different scopes.

Chair Gittins stated there is a not a majority in favor of a minor change, and he believes that the more appropriate route would be to consider this a major change since in the grand scheme of the project, it is a major change.

Ms. Brown stated that she agrees with Chair Gittins point, that this is a relatively small change. She stated that while she understands that some members want to see this site as mixed-use, the reality of the project is past that. She stated that if this were deemed a major change, they would have to resubmit and come back before the Board and present on the same proposal they have



already presented on.

Member Barbehenn stated she is not comfortable interpreting the zoning over the course of its many iterations to determine if this is a minor or major change. She asked if this is something they could have guidance from Counsel on. Mr. Fields stated that the way the bylaw is written, it is an interpretation of the Board. He added that it is a decision made entirely by the Board, and that decision cannot be challenged by the applicants.

Member Barbehenn stated she is rescinding her opinion and is abstaining from offering her opinion on minor versus major change. She stated she is not comfortable with the bylaw and how it has evolved overtime, and stated that nothing with this project's history has been consistent so she does not feel she can make a logical decision based on it.

Chair Gittins clarified that they now have two in favor of a minor change, one in favor of a major change, and that he is still going back and forth.

Member Hagan commented that Chair Gittins could also abstain. Chair Gittins agreed.

Chair Gittins clarified that they now have a 2-1-2 in favor of a minor change. He stated that it is unfortunate that this project could not have been handled more cleanly in the past.

Ms. Perry stated that once they decide if it is a minor change, they will have to discuss it and make the findings.

Mr. Fields stated that they should keep in mind that even though it is a 2-1 decision, it does not represent a majority of the board as two members abstained. He advised that given the nature of the conversation, the applicant can file it as a minor amendment, and in the deliberation of that amendment the Board could still decide if it needs to be elevated.

Ms. Brown asked for clarification on the timeline, as she was under the impression they were done tonight if the Board decides it is a minor amendment. Chair Gittins and Member Crowley clarified that they would need a final proposal, and Chair Gittins noted that he does not believe there would be too much discussion at that point given the discussions they have already had. Mr. Fields clarified that tonight's conversation was not listed as an amendment to the Special Permit, but rather this was a business session item to discuss how to move forward with the amendment.

Chair Gittins closed the business session. The Board agreed to a 5-minute recess, beginning at 8:25 and returning at 8:30.

## **MBTA Communities**

Chair Gittins introduced the MBTA Communities conversation, stating that tonight they will look at map concepts and discuss outreach both completed and upcoming. He added that he and Member Barbehenn have been working on a slide deck for outreach presentations and have potential edits to look at tonight.

Member Lloyd asked about the maps in the package, stating two of her maps were missing. Chair Gittins stated he will defer to Mr. Fields, however before that he wants to allow Member Barbehenn to summarize the outreach that has been completed.

Member Lloyd asked about the intent of where the slide deck will be used. Chair Gittins stated it was built off of the Bedford Day handout and he and Member Barbehenn are using it during conversations with various boards, committees and groups. Member Barbehenn added that they created it to expand on information that people want to hear to use during presentations with these various groups.

Member Lloyd stated that while she is not opposed to the slide deck, she believes any presentations that represent the Board as a whole should be agreed upon by the whole Board. She stated that she does have some edits to offer for the slides, including an edit to an argument for Town Center to be considered due to the infrastructure. She stated that the Board is not in full agreement on which areas are better than others for consideration and she does not believe infrastructure such as sewer and water are a part of the question.

Member Hagan stated that he received feedback from a member of the Board of Health, and they said that Member Barbehenn did an excellent job on the presentation and it was a very helpful conversation. He stated that the main goal is to education people of the Town, and the feedback he has heard is that these conversations with Member Barbehenn and Chair Gittins have been very informative and helpful. He added that they may not have a perfect slide deck because they do not yet have their final decisions made on where to put the zoning, but the verbal piece of the outreach has been very positive.

Chair Gittins stated that his thoughts are the idea was for he and Member Barbehenn to create the slide deck as a subcommittee, and present it to various groups as purely information and without taking a position on what would work best. He stated he understands they were taking some risks and liberties in interpreting the results from the survey and their sense of considerations. He stated that at the last meeting they did welcome any other Board members being involved and they would like feedback from the Board members, but they are trying to keep a cadence where they can get information out to as many people as possible.

Planning Board Minutes  
102423

Member Lloyd stated she did not realize until recently that staff does not have access to the survey, and she does not believe that is appropriate. She asked if staff could be made to have that information readily available.

Member Barbehenn stated the survey closes this Friday, October 27<sup>th</sup>, and stated it was her intent to pass the final response package to staff at that time. She stated she personally bought a license for the survey and she put the survey out because they needed to get it done. She added she does not have multiple seat permission with the license she has, and once the survey is complete she can download the results and pass them along.

Member Lloyd asked staff if the Planning Department has access to put surveys out, adding that the Town has done so before. Ms. Perry stated the original idea was that Mr. Fields would talk to the Select Board about the survey platform they used. Member Lloyd stated that should be done sooner rather than later, as they will most likely want to put out more surveys as they gather more information and those future surveys should be centralized.

Member Barbehenn stated that would have been great from the start, however they were pressed for time given the timeline of compliance and this was the quickest way for them to put out a survey. Member Lloyd clarified that they should look into the Town's survey platform so they can use it for future surveys. Member Barbehenn stated staff needs to look into it.

Ms. Perry stated she put flyers on a few bulletin boards around town. She stated that Stop and Shop seems to be the only retail space with a bulletin board, but she also hung flyers at Ashby Place and the DPW offices, and provided paper surveys to the Library and Council on Aging.

Member Barbehenn stated she asked the assistant library manager if they had any takers for the surveys, and they have not had any handed in. She asked if any paper copies of the survey been handed in to the Planning Department. Mr. Fields stated one was turned in to the Planning Department office, and staff will check with the Council on Aging for paper copies before the survey closes Friday.

Chair Gittins stated there is a hand raised in the audience, and opened the floor to public comment.

Nicholas Howard of 7 Daniels Drive stated he would like to raise an objection he had to the slide deck as it went out. He stated that the slides did take a stand on a number of issues, including the color coding of areas that would be best suited. He stated that the rubric used included things that inherently take a stand, and that were not necessarily consistent with what is coming from state guidance. He stated that they should be giving points to areas that make it easier to comply with the actual requirements of the law, and not necessarily to areas where the preferences are or what

people may like to see. He added that areas that are already zoned for multifamily housing could be grouped together to create the MBTA zoning as well as smaller parcels that can come together to make 5-acre plots scattered around to satisfy the requirements. He stated that the slides seemed to take a stance on certain things, but not things that Board has discussed caring about in previous meetings such as the impacts on number of students being added to schools and areas nears highway exits to minimize traffic through town.

Member Barbehenn stated that a major intent of the law at the state level is to create “transit-oriented development patterns”. She stated that communities under this law that have train stations or bus depots have to do their zoning within of radius of that. She added that the map from the slides is an outshoot of that concept, where a transit-oriented development is intended to design communities in a way that cuts down on traffic by lessening the opportunity and need for people to use cars. She thanked Mr. Howard for his comment and stated they will expand on the slides to better explain the intention.

Chair Gittins asked if other members of the Board had any further comments or questions before moving on to the maps.

Member Barbehenn gave an update on outreach activities. She stated that aside from meeting with the Board of Health, she also met with the Financial Committee and had a productive conversation with them. She highlighted that one of the significant points that came from that conversation was they saw a large need for engagement so that everyone in town understands the importance of this. She added that while they were discussing engagement, Fin Com worked the numbers and stated they have the money to allow the Board to do two town mailings related to MBTA Communities engagement between now and Spring Town Meeting.

Chair Gittins asked when Member Barbehenn would have her notes from the Fin Com meeting ready to be shared with the Board. Member Barbehenn stated she is hoping to be ready to distribute the notes next week, and noted the meeting was recorded if any members would like to watch the full meeting.

Member Crowley thanked the subcommittee for their hard work. He stated that he is still struggling greatly with the state forcing them ignore conforming versus non-conforming lots. He stated Resident District C has 85% non-conforming lots and Resident District B has 38% non-conforming lots, and it is a huge struggle for him to omit the special permit process and to not be able to restrict the density.

Chair Gittins stated they can have height and setback restrictions, but the density has to support the 15 units per acre. Member Crowley agreed but stated from his time served on the Zoning Board of Appeals, he has seen projects maximized to those restrictions, and in terms of the small

lots in town it scares him to have no special permit process.

Member Barbehenn shared her screen to show slides on what surrounding communities are doing. She highlighted where other communities are in their process, what their process is, and showed maps of potential zoning areas being looked at. Communities discussed where Lincoln, Billerica, Concord, Burlington, and Lexington.

Member Crowley asked for clarification on if they are planning to prepare one map for Spring Town Meeting. Chair Gittins stated that is the goal, and acknowledged it is an aggressive schedule. Member Barbehenn stated the goal is to agree on the one map by the end of December.

Ms. Perry she has spoken with Chris Nelson to help them prepare maps outside of Fall Town Meeting, but they need to receive clear direction from the Board. Chair Gittins stated he hopes the remainder of the discussion will provide answers. Ms. Perry stated that bullet points on the maps will not be able to be reviewed by the Board given where they are in the timeline.

Chair Gittins shared his screen to move to review of the maps. Mr. Fields apologized if any maps were missed but can still be added.

Chair Gittins shared the map titled "Town Center Concept3". Mr. Fields explained that the Board has looked at an approximate 50-acre block in the north side of Great Road, and separately looked at an approximate 50-acre block in the south side of Great Road. He stated that this version shows an even split between neighborhoods north and south of Great Road, centered on the intersection of South Road, Great Road and Springs Road. He stated that at this time, they should not focus on the inclusion or exclusion of certain pieces of land, but rather focus on what are the impacts if they assign some or all of this area to the MBTA Communities district. He stated that as Mr. Crowley mentioned, most of these lots are non-conforming, meaning redevelopment typically requires a review. He added that if this were zoned to be part of the MBTA Communities, they would have to change the bylaw to not only create the overlay district, but also to create a permit process that does not require ZBA public hearings for projects that would be submitted under the MBTA overlay.

Member Crowley clarified that the permit process would only include multifamily housing. Mr. Fields stated that there are also implications that if someone were to build two duplexes on the same lot rather than one structure with four units, that would be allowed under MBTA Communities.

Member Lloyd stated that given the number of non-conforming lots in this area, creating two duplexes on the same lot would be virtually impossible to build. She stated that using 10,000 square feet, which is larger than many lots in this area, after considering the setback

requirements, 2,450 square feet is left available to build on.

Ms. Perry stated there are different ways they can define the zoning, including putting a maximum unit per acre. She added they could also be specific on what types of buildings they could allow in an area like this, by allowing “x” amount of units per lot or allowing buildings with up to “x” amount of units each. She added that they could also play around with the parameters of lots sizes, as lots would need to be conforming under MBTA Communities.

Member Lloyd stated she has a problem with the center of town, and added they are not address the larger issues. She stated the first issue is there are a significant number of very old, historic houses in this area. She stated the second issue is with the large amount of non-conforming lots in this area, those smaller lots have smaller houses that are already more affordable than other areas, and they would be potentially getting rid of those options. She added that it is far less likely for a smaller lot, even if it was zoned to be compliant, to have a developer want to build a multifamily option there. She stated the bigger issue overall is some members are focusing on what would be best for the Town of Bedford, but they should be looking at what will the voters of Bedford will vote for. She added that she believes there may be an issue with these areas of town that people do not want to see changed, and they should be thinking about the marketing along with the information.

Chair Gittins stated that what he wants for display outside of Fall Town Meeting is three maps for people to look at an decide if they love it, hate it, or what changes they might want to make. He stated he understands not everyone will concur with all maps, but he wants to come away with three different maps that they can gather true feedback from going forward.

Chair Gittins stated that looking at the current map, not focusing on positives and negatives, is there enough here to present this map as an option for discussion outside of Fall Town Meeting. He added that he feels it is important to have one map that includes the town center for discussion. He stated it does not have to be this map.

Member Lloyd stated she feels they are putting too much weigh to the RKG map, which did not look at the town individually.

Member Crowley stated he likes that this map includes areas both north and south of the center, and thinks whatever is displayed for the town of the center includes both areas. He asked for clarification on if they are only creating a zoning overlay district for multifamily, and that they are not making changes that would also change single or two-family housing. Ms. Perry stated they can decide if they want to lower the lot sizes for all usages or just in compliance with MBTA Communities. Chair Gittins stated it is to be determined what is on the table, and added that while he would like to see the minimum lot sizes heavily reduced in the town center, it may

be too much to work on to prepare for Spring Town Meeting.

Member Barbehenn asked for clarification on if non-conforming lots can still by-right build multifamily housing under this law. Ms. Perry stated that all conforming lots are different. Member Barbehenn asked if this mandate is overriding current regulations for non-conforming lots. Mr. Fields stated they will have to create a set of parameters within the overlay district that overcome the non-conforming factors, so that multifamily housing requires no special permits under the overlay district.

Member Barbehenn asked if that means they will have to change the underlying zoning. Mr. Fields stated that one option is to change the underlying zoning, and another option is to have the overlay district supersede the underlying requirements.

Member Barbehenn stated she agrees with Chair Gittins statement that what they need to present outside of Fall Town Meeting is a variety of concepts for the town to discuss and not predefine where they should go. She stated some logical options to have are the center of town, a mixed-use area, and potentially an option further away from the center. She added that she believes the final creation should be a combination of areas from all maps that community members liked.

Member Barbehenn stated that with this map specifically, she likes the idea of it but has created a map with a few changes. She shared her screen to first show a map she presented to the Planning Board back when the law was first introduced, which highlighted areas of town within ½ mile of bus stops and ¼ mile of bike paths. She shared her screen to show the map she created that is similar to the “Town Center Concept3” map being discussed, but the districts are moved slightly to the east to be centered on the Route 62 Bus and the Narrow Gauge Path. She noted that the map also includes an area to be potentially considered for mixed-use, highlighting the Wholefoods Plaza and surrounding parcels as well as parcels across the street.

Member Lloyd offered an edit to the map, stating at the bottom of Elm Street is town housing and they should not include that. Member Barbehenn stated the boundaries she drew are rough estimates and they can adjust.

Member Lloyd stated they should remove anything part of the historic district. Chair Gittins agreed and stated the rest of the map looks good.

Member Barbehenn stated she will send the map to Mr. Fields.

Chair Gittins restated he would like to reach a goal of having three maps ready to present outside Fall Town Meeting. He added that if a majority of the feedback is against the town center then they will pursue something else, and if a majority of the feedback is for the town center then they

Planning Board Minutes  
102423

can further work that concept. Member Crowley asked if they have to limit themselves to three maps, stating he believes having two separate maps on the town center would be helpful to receive feedback on. Chair Gittins agreed, stating he used the number three as it seems reasonable to prepare in time.

Chair Gittins opened Public Comment due to a hand raised in the audience.

Nicholas Howard of 7 Daniels Drive asked if the Board would be open to entertaining map proposals from the citizenry that could be given to them in time to prepare something to go alongside their maps. Chair Gittins stated they would absolutely be open to that.

Member Barbehenn stated that with regards to using the mixed-use allowance towards complying with the law, she would love to have one of the maps include that 25% parcel area. She added that they need to understand for sure what can and cannot be done with those locations, specifically the Stop and Shop plaza. She stated that with all of the engagement she has done to date, that location comes up as the logical area to do the mixed-use component, but she does not feel that they have gotten a clear understanding related to the flood-plain rules and if that location can be an option or not.

Ms. Perry stated one question here is whether the mixed-use districts can remain requiring mixed-use and be counted in some way, to which the answer she has obtained is no. She stated there was a recent change to the guidelines that she sent out in a memo, and added she attended a webinar that went into more detail about the change and it seems that it does not benefit Bedford because of the numbers the town is allocated. She stated that they could not understand it at first because it sounds like a contradiction, however it seems that other towns have a higher unit requirement within their 50 acres and it was made clear that this will not benefit Bedford.

Member Barbehenn asked why they are talking about if flood-plains are an issue if they knew the whole time this location could not be counted. She stated that she understood the math worked out that 15% in capacity is 186 units, which she stated they could easily put 186 units in the Stop and Shop plaza in a mixed-use scenario. Ms. Perry asked for clarification on what Member Barbehenn is referring to with 15%, stating she was talking about whether or not they could count mixed-use areas as contributing 25% of the capacity, which she added only applies to certain towns and not to Bedford. Member Barbehenn asked how she is calculating 25% of what it can be used for. Ms. Perry stated they are still required to provide 50 acres of just MBTA Communities overlay zoning, and she sent out a memo about this that goes into further detail.

Ms. Perry stated that the other issue is the flood-plains. She stated that she looked at the state website about regulating flood-plains and it appeared from the website as if it did not need to be in the zoning, but she contacted the state coordinator who seemed surprised about the idea of



taking it out of the zoning bylaw. She stated she believes they do need to keep the land use regulation in the zoning bylaw, but they could change it to be without a special permit. She stated that from their research of surrounding towns, the way to do it seems to be if you have a Zoning Special Permit or Site Plan Review happening, that it would be included. She added that if you did not have one of those happening, it would be handled prior to a building permit, and added that this would be written into a revised version of the zoning bylaw.

Member Hagan stated that Bedford is in a different position than some other towns given the 37 foot height restriction. He asked that if they take away the height restriction for a moment, and if you could build a dense 70-foot mixed-use building, is that state not accepting this as part of the requirement. Ms. Perry stated they are not allowing anything to count in an area where mixed-use is required. She stated housing-only developments would have to be allowed in an area where mixed-use happens to be in order for any units within the mixed-use building to count. She added that as long as they allow multifamily developments only in an area, they could also allow mixed-use developments and those units would count. She stated they could incentivize for mixed-use if that is what they wanted to do.

Member Hagan clarified that they could both be allowed and still count. Ms. Perry stated as long as mixed-use is not required, they could allow it and it would count.

Chair Gittins stated that in principle, they could change the zoning in the Great Road and Shawsheen districts to mixed-use by right and multifamily by right, so a developer could exercise either option. Mr. Fields and Ms. Perry agreed that is correct.

Member Lloyd asked what happened with the Lexington incentives for mixed-use and if that is no longer going to be applicable. Ms. Perry stated the way Lexington wrote the bylaw, under the original rules it would not count towards the MBTA Communities requirements.

Member Barbehenn stated that what she is understanding from Ms. Perry's statements, is that no town is able to use any straight up mixed-use zoning as that 25% of their capacity. Ms. Perry stated that some towns have different requirements than Bedford. Member Barbehenn asked if when taking away the nuances, is the general concept that you can use 25% of mixed-use as is. Ms. Perry stated not in Bedford.

Member Barbehenn stated she does not understand and asked for further clarification. Ms. Perry stated that she can send information in greater detail from the memo she sent to explain it better, adding that the ruling is rather obscure and not obvious.

Member Barbehenn stated that when talking to residents, she has to make it simple for them to understand. Ms. Perry stated that in resident simple language, we cannot count our current

mixed-use districts unless we also allow housing only developments in those districts. Chair Gittins clarified that mixed-use can be allowed, but also housing-only has to be allowed.

Member Barbehenn asked that to Member Lloyd's point, if they can incentivize mixed-use in those districts like Lexington did with height. Mr. Fields stated that is something Lexington did and that is something that staff would most likely recommend.

Member Hagan asked if they are going to continue to run into the 37-foot height requirement, or if they could wrap a height increase in as part of the MBTA overlay districts, or if that would be too much. Ms. Perry stated there are different ways to do it. She stated they could allow 2-stories for housing only and 3-stories for mixed-use, they could allow 3-stories for housing only and up to 5-stories for mixed-use, or any combination they would like to allow.

Mr. Fields stated that before the Board gets too concerned with the dimensional criteria, the Board should focus on the geography. He added that then they could have RKG assist with advising on the dimensional criteria depending upon the areas they choose.

Chair Gittins stated he would like the Board to have general agreement on multiple maps to have displayed before Fall Town Meeting. He stated that going back, they have looked at two town center oriented maps, one by staff and one by Member Barbehenn.

Member Barbehenn shared her screen to reshow her map. Chair Gittins asked for thumbs up or down on if this map is a good basis for refining for Fall Town Meeting. Chair Gittins, Member Hagan, and Member Barbehenn gave thumbs up. Member Lloyd stated that with edits she would give thumbs up. Member Crowley gave thumbs down, stating that he prefers the other map but has some bias.

Chair Gittins shared his screen to show the next map, "Whole Town 2" by Member Lloyd. Member Lloyd explained she made three separate maps, each of different areas, and this whole town map highlights all the areas she created maps on. The map highlights the Woburn Sportsmen's Association on Middlesex Turnpike, a large piece of the Shawsheen District which includes the Stop and Shop Plaza, and multiple pieces of the Depot District. Member Lloyd noted the areas of the Depot District that she left out are the park at the end of the bike path, the depot parking lot and privately-owned pieces, and the Freight House.

Member Hagan stated he is not in favor of a map including the Woburn Sportsmen's Association and believes that should not be included in any map presented to the town. Member Lloyd stated that if members are part owners, he would have to recuse himself for having a financial relationship. Member Hagan stated he does not have a financial relationship and does not understand why this location keeps being brought up and directed towards him.

Chair Gittins paused the conversation and stated the ultimate goal is to have multiple maps to present outside Fall Town Meeting. He stated the Board has discussed the potential of a map including Middlesex Turnpike and the Woburn Sportsmen's Association, and while they may know some people may not be happy to see that kind of map, the whole point is to hear the feedback on what people like and don't like.

Member Barbehenn stated she likes some of the areas Member Lloyd has highlighted, and suggested that for presenting, they show each area on its own map rather than on a town wide view.

Member Crowley asked if these areas together equal the required acreage, and asked if they would need to be presented all together to meet the requirement. Member Lloyd stated these areas together are greater than the requirement, however she does not know the exact acreage on each area to know what could be omitted and still meeting the requirement.

Member Crowley stated it is important to note that the area of the Woburn Sportsmen's Association on Middlesex Turnpike is already zoned for residential. Member Lloyd added that it would also be entirely their choice if they wanted to redevelop or not.

Chair Gittins restated the goal of creating maps to obtain feedback. He stated that he does not believe any map they present first will be adopted as is, and that they will use the feedback to create better iterations.

Member Barbehenn asked if they can present four maps instead of three, where one map highlights the Town Center, one map highlights the Depot district area, one map highlights the Shawsheen district area, and one map highlights the Middlesex Turnpike area. She added she believes this will help people understand the variety of ways the Town can comply, and people could help them decide to move forward with one concept or a combination of concepts. Chair Gittins agreed.

Chair Gittins stated that staff can proceed with creating display maps based off the conversations tonight. Chair Gittins stated that Member Barbehenn's map of the center can be revised and used. Member Lloyd suggested removing all elements of the historic district. Member Barbehenn stated she will revise and send to staff.

Chair Gittins asked if Member Crowley favors the town center map that Mr. Fields created. Member Crowley stated that he does favor it, but if the majority of the Board prefers Member Barbehenn's map then he is okay with showing her map. Chair Gittins stated they do not need to limit what maps are shown.

Member Lloyd asked Member Crowley what about Mr. Fields' map he likes. Member Crowley stated he prefers the evenness between the north and south areas Mr. Fields highlighted compared to Member Barbehenn's map that follows the path of the Narrow Gauge Trail in the north area of the map. He stated he does not understand why the zoning would follow Narrow Gauge and not other rail trails. Member Lloyd stated the Narrow Gauge Trail in the north section of the map goes the same way as the bus route.

Member Barbehenn agreed that the reasoning is because the Narrow Gauge and the bus route follow the same path, and added that the Narrow Gauge is part of the state's commuter bike path. Member Crowley stated he also has bias as this encompasses his neighborhood.

Chair Gittins stated that it sounds like the Board has come to a consensus on which maps to present, and added that audience member Mr. Howard also suggested there could be more coming from residents.

Member Barbehenn stated she is not sure on the exact acreage of the areas they have defined tonight, and that they should consider that when presenting. She added that while she is in favor of seeing suggestions and maps from residents, they may not want to present any resident maps outside of Fall Town Meeting because the Board does not have another meeting before then to discuss any resident maps. She added that it is appropriate to add any resident maps to the focus group conversations and town wide discussions.

Chair Gittins agreed that given they do not have another meeting before Fall Town Meeting, it may be more appropriate to wait to include resident maps.

Member Crowley asked if there is anything they can create with 225 and North Road, or if it is not possible due to wetlands. Member Barbehenn and Chair Gittins agreed that the triangle area between 225 and North Road is heavy wetlands. Mr. Fields noted that the question being raised includes the North Road Business District which includes mixed-use zoning, however this area was originally not considered due to lack of bus routes.

Member Lloyd stated she would be in favor of considering some of that area. She added that if they can have an area that is at least 25 acres, then having a patchwork of different sections is okay with her and may appeal to more people. She stated that they would need to be careful about which areas they choose, adding that a section of North Road is included in the historic district.

Chair Gittins asked for clarification from the Board if they are okay with the two town center maps and the three areas Member Lloyd zoned in the town wide map. Ms. Perry asked for

Planning Board Minutes  
102423

clarification, stating she believed they chose four maps with only one town center map. Chair Gittins stated he believes they should go with two town center maps and the map Member Lloyd created.

Member Lloyd stated her map is not one large district, but rather a combination of all areas she found appropriate to consider. She added that she agrees with Member Barbehenn's suggestion of presenting each area as a separate district and separate map to gather feedback on each area individually. She added that she believes they should only have one town center map instead of two, stating it may be confusing to have two overlapping and similar maps of town center.

Chair Gittins stated there was more support for Member Barbehenn's town center map, so they will go with that one. He asked about the acreage of the Stop and Shop plaza. Mr. Fields stated the plaza is about 20 acres, and the Shawsheen District as a whole is about 55 acres. Mr. Fields stated that the Woburn Sportsmen's Association is about 40 acres, but they have also discussed offline the potential to include a greater area of Middlesex Turnpike.

Member Barbehenn stated she views the Shawsheen District as a map of its own, the town center as a map of its own, and the third map will be a combination of areas within the Depot District that Member Lloyd identified.

Chair Gittins asked if the Board wants to include the Middlesex Turnpike map as the fourth map or if they are happy with the three chosen. Member Lloyd and Member Crowley stated they should try it to gain feedback.

Ms. Perry asked if with the Depot map, if the Board wants staff to find a way to combine the areas selected into a single district. Member Lloyd asked if they can be a single district even if they do not touch each other. Chair Gittins stated as long as one area is 25 acres that would be fine. Member Lloyd added it is intentionally separate because she excluded certain areas.

Member Lloyd stated her preference is to present it as one district with three separate elements. Member Barbehenn asked for clarification on the areas that make the district unable to be continuous. Member Lloyd stated the town own land is excluded, the bike shop is excluded as it is an iconic building to Bedford, and private parcels are excluded.

Chair Gittins clarified that there is a reason Member Lloyd created the district as three separate plots, and for presenting outside of Fall Town Meeting we want to maintain those separate plots. Member Lloyd agreed.

Chair Gittins stated he anticipated feedback from residents and they will be able to use that going forward, and feels the Board is in good shape.

Planning Board Minutes  
102423

Chair Gittins asked if the Board or staff has any further comments or questions. Mr. Fields stated that staff has a good sense of direction for creating the maps.

Member Barbehenn asked if the Board will be meeting in the library before setting up outside of Fall Town Meeting to look over the maps before discussion. Ms. Perry stated they may not be able to if they would like to be staffing outside of Town Meeting early. Mr. Fields stated that Fall Town Meeting starts at 6:30. Member Lloyd stated that they should be there at least by 6, and Member Barbehenn suggested 5:30.

Ms. Perry stated that staff has discussed and will post a meeting notice for the event. Mr. Fields stated the intent is to have 24x36 inch maps set up on A frame easels. He added they can have a table, but engagement may be happening standing rather than seated.

Member Lloyd asked which space they have. Mr. Fields stated he will work with the facilities director to know the exact space they can set up. Member Lloyd stated there is typically space for two tables in between the two doors, and they want to allow enough space that the easels are not kicked over and they do not create a bottleneck. Member Barbehenn agreed.

Member Barbehenn asked if they can have copies of the Bedford Day brochure to hand out. Mr. Fields stated staff will make copies.

Ms. Perry asked if the Board would like bullet points prepared for each map to highlight the obvious advantages and disadvantages, as the Board discussed this idea at previous meetings. Chair Gittins stated Board members should send points they want to make about any maps and if staff has any suggestions to include them.

Member Hagan asked if they should provide blank maps with markers to allow people to draw out their ideas and further engage people. Chair Gittins agreed.

Member Barbehenn for Member Hagan to repeat his suggestion. Member Hagan stated his idea is to have blank maps that cover the areas they are presenting, and to allow people to look at their maps and then draw on blank maps any changes they may want to make to better visualize what people are interested in. Member Barbehenn stated she likes the idea and suggested they use regular 8x11 inch blank maps to hand to people as they look.

Member Barbehenn stated that along with the pamphlets, they should have a table to set up a monitor to continuously run the slide deck that they created and discussed edits of tonight.

Member Lloyd stated that she likes Member Hagan's idea, however she is concerned that most

Planning Board Minutes  
102423

residents show up all at once for Fall Town Meeting and there may be too many people and not enough time. She suggested they could have red, yellow and green dots for people to stick on maps or specific areas within the maps to highlight what they like or don't like. Member Hagan stated it does make sense, however with not a lot of time it may be simpler for people to draw a quick line or circle on blank maps.

Chair Gittins stated this is more of an awareness raising event, and they still have the focus group and public outreach sessions to go more in depth. He added that he believes sketching on a blank map would be fine.

Member Barbehenn suggested a combination of these ideas. She stated the main goal is to get people involved and interested, and they still have a month to collect detailed comments. She suggested handing everybody an 8x11 map that they can play around with before the end of the meeting and hand in on the way out. She added they can use the colored stickers during focus groups once they have more defined maps.

Chair Gittins opened Public Comment due to a hand raised in the audience.

Nicholas Howard of 7 Daniels Drive stated it may be more effective if they present a handful of preselected, 25-acre lots that have already been vetted as 25-acres that would qualify. He stated that people will either like it or not, but if they do like it the Board can say this is a lot that will qualify as is and can be used if the feedback is positive. He added that they need to start with finding the 25-acres, and the rest of it can be pieced together a handful of other areas to reach the requirement, but they need a 25-acre lot that the town agrees on so that will get passed.

Chair Gittins asked Ms. Perry for a rough estimate of the time it will take to qualify a map. Ms. Perry stated that Chris Nelson assists with creating maps and running them through the model, so it is more dependent on his availability. She added that areas that Board is sure on will be quicker versus areas where they need to make decisions about the boundaries.

Member Lloyd stated they should plan to have a relatively simplistic article to put in The Bedford Citizen about a week after Fall Town Meeting to summarize what was discussed and to continue educating people. Member Barbehenn added they could do the same thing before Fall Town Meeting to let people know they are planning to be there to give out information and seek feedback.

Member Crowley stated he thought there was already an article. Member Barbehenn stated they could put out a short one paragraph blurb similar to how Ms. Perry created one about the survey. Ms. Perry stated she could create a news flash on the town website and send it to The Bedford Citizen.

Member Lloyd suggested they add something to the Bedford Facebook group. Ms. Perry stated they can post a memo on the Planning Board Facebook, as things they post are usually picked up and shared to the various groups. Chair Gittins agreed.

Chair Gittins stated that they were awarded the technical assistance grant, and Mr. Fields set up a zoom call with RKG for November 2<sup>nd</sup>. He stated he would like to sit in on that, and invited members to pass along any questions or comments they may have. Member Lloyd asked for clarification on the day and time. Chair Gittins stated it is a Thursday at 11am.

Chair Gittins stated his thought is to chat with the consults on the 2<sup>nd</sup>, gather feedback from Fall Town Meeting on the 6<sup>th</sup>, and then they can have another discussion with the consults after.

### **Comprehensive Plan Preparation**

The Board moved to defer their conversation to the next Planning Board meeting due to time.

### **Board Liaison Reports**

Member Lloyd reported she attended the MAGIC meeting this morning and they had a presentation from the MPO, which controls the Tip Funding. She stated they discussed that from 2025 to 2029 they are looking for projects. She added they also launched a pilot program that helps towns get designs up and running.

Member Barbehenn asked for clarification on the category of projects. Member Lloyd stated it is transportation, but any forms and elements of transportation. Member Barbehenn asked if Member Lloyd could share information from the meeting. Member Lloyd stated she would type out her notes.

Member Barbehenn had nothing relevant to report.

Member Crowley had nothing relevant to report.

Member Hagan had nothing relevant to report.

Chair Gittins had nothing relevant to report.

### **Staff Updates**

Mr. Fields suggested to skip staff updates due to time. The Board agreed.



**Minutes**

The board received the minutes of its October 10 meeting.

MOTION: Member Hagan proposed and Member Barbehenn seconded, to approve the minutes without 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 Crowley seconded, to adjourn at 10:27

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 20, 2023, from Planning Director D. Anthony Fields, for Planning Board meeting

100 Plank Street- 2010 Zoning Bylaw IMU Excerpt

100 Plank Street- 3-page Ground Floor Options dated September 25, 2023

Planning Board Minutes  
102423

MBTA Communities Concept Map- Middlesex

MBTA Communities Concept Map- Town Center

MBTA Communities Concept Map- Town Wide

29-Page PowerPoint Presentation by Jacinda Barbehenn and Christopher Gittins dated October 19, 2023, titled “Massachusetts' Housing Choice Initiative: Expanding Opportunities for Multifamily Housing in Bedford”

6-Page PowerPoint Presentation by Jacinda Barbehenn dated October 24, 2023, titled “MBTA 3A Housing Choice Law – Update to Bedford Planning Board”

Master Plan Budget Concept

Carlisle Road LLC Update to Select Board dated October 2, 2023, revised October 10, 2023

Development Update from Planning Department Staff dated October 19, 2023

Article titled “Why is the state still letting places like Braintree kill the housing we desperately need?” by The Editorial Board dated October 10, 2023

Article titled “Private jets, public interest: Clash over bid to expand Hanscom space” by Letters dated October 7, 2023

Draft minutes from Planning Board meeting October 10, 2023

Various press articles on topics of planning interest