



TOWN OF BOXBOROUGH

Planning Board

29 Middle Road, Boxborough, Massachusetts 01719

Phone (978) 264-1723 • Fax (978) 264-3127

www.boxborough-ma.gov

Mark Barbadoro, Chair • Cindy Markowitz, Clerk • Mark White • Robin Lazarow • Rebecca Verner

APPROVED ON June 13, 2022

Meeting Minutes

May 16, 2022

7:00 PM

Remote Meeting

Members Present: Mark Barbadoro (Chair), Cindy Markowitz (Clerk), Rebecca Verner, Robin Lazarow, Janet Connolly (alternate).

Staff Present: Tracy Murphy, Town Planner; Sue Carter, PLACES Associates; and Jonathan Eichman, Town legal counsel

Chair Barbadoro called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

Mr. Barbadoro introduced the new Town Planner, Tracy Murphy. She has eight years' experience in this position, with a background as a landscape architect.

Ms. Murphy noted that she is coming from the community of Winchendon and is excited to work with the Town. The Board welcomed Ms. Murphy.

Public Comment – none at this time

The Board welcomed Rich Guzzardi, from the Economic Development Committee (EDC), to discuss ideas for getting funding to develop out the downtown/Route 111 area.

Mr. Guzzardi explained that this is being examined through the Massachusetts One Stop grant program. An annual grant cycle can be pursued, and it closes this year on June 2, 2022. Two expressions of interest were submitted to the State in March for a Town center revitalization project and a pop-up market project. Feedback was received from the State. One proposal is for a grant application for Town center revitalization technical services. The intent is to look at the existing conditions of the area and think about revitalization in a broad, cohesive way to create a center of business and municipal activity. This would possibly look at funding for an overlay district. He has been working to get quotes from consultants to include in the application. He does not want to do this through the EDC alone and would like to collaborate with the Planning Board.

Ms. Markowitz explained that she wants to make sure the Town doesn't compete against itself for grant opportunities. There are a lot of MVP and TAP grants that have been sought in the past, so she wants to make sure this is done in a thoughtful way. Mr. Guzzardi agreed that there should be some prioritization set. He noted that a TAP grant through ULI Boston New England could be

pursued. Through this there is the possibility of holding a large charrette, where the consultant, landowners, and all with interest in the project could be present to discuss the item openly. This would be at no cost to the Town.

Mr. Guzzardi stated that he will keep the Board apprised moving forward.

**984 and 996 Massachusetts Avenue & 38 Sara's Way – continued from March 14, 2022
April 11, 2022, and May 2, 2022**

Owner/Applicant: Larry White

Engineer: Greg Roy, Dillis & Roy Civil Design Group, Inc.

Surveyor: Stan Dillis, Dillis & Roy Civil Design Group, Inc.

Site Plan and Special Permits

Ms. Connolly sat for Mark White.

Chair Barbadoro opened the hearing and read the notice. He stated that he would like to get public comment out of the way early in the conversation and then review the draft decision.

There was no public comment at this time.

Greg Roy, Dillis & Roy; Paul Lewandowski, LRDesigns, Inc.; and Johnathan Silverstein, legal counsel from Blatman, Bobrowski, & Haverty, LLC, addressed the Board.

Mr. Roy stated that he has submitted a set of revised plans and a cover letter dated May 10, 2022. The main changes to the plan include changes to the topography for a section of the site behind units 1 and 2. The existing topography is flatter toward the top, so not as much grading will be needed and more plantings can be placed. A headwall is now proposed as far from the two existing trees as possible to help with drainage. An additional change to the plan is to change the radius from 50' to 30'. The Mass DOT Highway Permit application has been accepted, though not yet approved. The existing width is proposed to be kept, but the radii will be rounded off. All of the turning movement diagrams have been amended to show this as well. Trucks will be entering the site from the west and the Littleton ladder truck was used to demonstrate that this radius is appropriate for that size truck. The landscape plans have also been amended. The vegetation gap at the toe of the septic slope has been filled in, and all of the existing trees on Mass Ave. are planned to be kept. The landscape plan also looks to keep more of the canopy in one area of the site.

Ms. Carter stated that some of the red cedars are proposed along the berm, which would cause issue with maintenance. She suggested that the Board could allow for small changes in the proposed locations for the trees on site during construction, so that the best possible placements can be made at that time. Ms. Verner agreed and noted that this could be added to the conditions for the decision.

Ms. Carter noted that she would like to see the information on the plan to show a very tight swale. Also, less pavement in Sara's Way could allow for a tighter truck turn.

Mr. Roy explained that both his client and Mark White would like to keep the geometry of Sara's Way as it exists today.

Ms. Markowitz stated that she is unclear as to how tree cover is being proposed in the reserve leach area. Mr. Roy stated that the reserve is not planned to be built unless necessary in the future. Commonly, vegetation is left in these areas. Ms. Verner agreed with Ms. Markowitz that more screening might be needed in that area if the trees were to be taken in the future and that she has a draft condition for this item.

Ms. Markowitz stated that she looked at the prior subdivision decision. It required a 22' wide roadway and she is unclear as to why this was never completed. There was never a waiver requested. She stated that she believes the width of the road should be reduced. The beginning of that roadway is within the wetland buffer zone, so any reduction in pavement would be a benefit in terms of the wetland buffer. She is advocating for a road width of less than the existing 30'. The subdivision rules and regulations document has a Table 1 on page 22 that specifies roadway widths. The maximum width for an artery road is 30'. This road was supposed to be 22' and there was never an amendment requested for this, but the road now sits at well over 30'.

Ms. Carter stated that the document specifies 22' for local streets and 24' for a collector street. Typically, next to this pavement width would be a Cape Cod berm, which could then add another approximately 1' to the road. Arterial roads are similar to Route 111. Commercial roads would be similar to Stow Road. These standards are for new construction only. There are current commercial roads that are less than this.

Ms. Markowitz asked if there can be a 30' radii and a narrower road width. Ms. Carter stated that the proposed width likely could be narrowed a bit. The road could be narrowed with a bump out spot in front of the mailboxes. Ms. Markowitz stated that she would be supportive of this type of a proposal.

It was noted that the speed limit along Route 111 at that point in the road is 40mph. Mr. Barbadoro stated that a wider road and larger turning radii is likely needed along a faster road. Ms. Markowitz stated that the 30' width seems to be standard in the area. Ms. Lazarow stated that, as this will be a residential area, a narrower road might encourage vehicles to travel more slowly into the area. Ms. Carter noted that this site will be accessed once or twice a week at this time. Ms. Connolly stated that this is the current amount of traffic going onto the site, but this could change in the future.

Ms. Verner stated that she believed other options for the driveway were going to be reviewed this time. This seems quite large for a residential setting.

Ms. Verner stated that it seems to be a bad practice to flow water out onto Route 111. This water is typically managed on property. Mr. Roy stated that there are no other options for this site. Ms. Verner stated that she believes the area needs to be graded out and then shown to the Board. There will likely be regrade necessary in that slope area, and this could be impactful.

Ms. Verner stated that there are multiple types of cedar and spruce trees designated on the landscaping plan, but certain areas are not designated for a certain type of tree. She asked for the ability to mark up the plan with which species would be best for each location. Mr. Roy agreed.

In response to a question from Ms. Connolly, Mr. Roy stated that there is approximately 300' of frontage from Sara's Way along this lot.

Mr. Roy stated that he believes the concerns with the floor area have been resolved and there have been no changes made to the architectural.

Mr. Barbadoro stated that the Board seems to be concerned with the table matching the trees, the species of trees being designated, and the placement of the trees on site being verified by the Town's consultant arborist.

Mr. Barbadoro noted that Town Counsel only had a comment regarding one of the proposed conditions and has stated that there is nothing in the bylaw that specifies the Board being able to limit the price of the property. However, if the applicant is willing, a condition can be added to limit the price. The applicant has proposed to sell these units as "moderately priced." A family of four's income for this county is in the median of \$140,000. This was used to suggest a reasonable "moderately priced" unit.

Mr. Barbadoro suggested that the Board review the draft conditions with the applicant and then consider closing the hearing. After the meeting, a revised draft decision can be sent to Town Counsel for review and revisions. Ms. Markowitz noted that she is having trouble marrying the Board's proposed conditions with those suggested by the applicant.

Johnathan Silverstein, applicant's attorney, stated that, aside from the condition previously mentioned regarding unit pricing, the applicant is willing to accept all other proposed conditions. Mr. Barbadoro noted that the only concern he has is that many of the proposed conditions were drafted without review by all Board members. He would like for each proposed condition to be reviewed by both the applicant and the Board.

Under condition #3, it was suggested to add item f:

"Should reserve leaching area be required at a future date, applicant shall provide additional screening along the western property line. Evergreen screening shall consist of 6 *Picea abies*, Norway spruce, at 10' in height or higher."

Also, to add item g:

"A certified Arborist or registered Landscape Architect shall whether sufficient root mass will remain after grading for the trees along Massachusetts Avenue to survive. Flexibility shall be maintained on the placement of screening to avoid damage to critical root mass of the trees along Massachusetts Avenue. Placement shall be field reviewed and adjusted upon mutual consent between the Planning Board's consultant Landscape Architect and the applicant."

Attorney Silverstein stated that the applicant would prefer a certified arborist be used for the review, due to an increased cost using PLACES Associates. There could be reporting made to the Board. Ms. Verner noted that there was recently a large clearing that took place without the Board's knowledge. She would be wary to use someone other than the Town's consultant. Ms. Carter stated that a certified arborist is likely as good, if not better, than a landscape consultant at evaluating the health of a tree. Ms. Verner stated that a certified arborist is fine, though she believes third party review could be important for some of these items. There has already been tree clearing completed by this applicant and she isn't sure if the Board should use a consultant hired by the applicant himself. The applicant agreed for this person to be designated by the Planning Board.

Condition #6 was amended to include the language, "Such utilities shall be routed through Sara's Way as approved by the Littleton Electric Light Department or other utility company."

Condition #8 was amended to include the following language, "...following Board of Health conditions, *which include, but may not be limited to, the following...*"

Condition #9 was amended by striking the following, "If, upon removal of old cars, equipment, machinery or other materials from the existing site, there is evidence of staining of soils," and "Visual review of the site is to be conducted by the Town's consulting engineer during or immediately following removal of machinery/equipment. No work may be done on site until all machinery is removed and this condition has been satisfied." Also, to include the wording, "Prior to the issuance of the first Certificate of Occupancy, the Applicant/Owner must provide a report to the Planning Department that the site..."

Regarding condition #10, Section 6204 was noted to be the section for Outdoor Lighting.

Regarding condition #11, Mr. Roy stated that he is unclear as to why the Planning Board is regulating indoor lighting; this appears to be an issue of Building Code, which the applicant will follow. The Board agreed to strike this item.

The Board struck condition #13.

Regarding condition #15, the language "Construction General Permit (CGP)" was added to the end of the item.

Regarding condition #16, the Board added the word "Stormwater" before "Rules and Regulations."

In response to a question from Ms. Markowitz, Mr. Roy explained that the six units will be responsible entirely for a portion of the infrastructure on the condominium association's land. The Sara's Way right of way infrastructure will be shared by the existing owners and the new condominium association.

Regarding condition #21, item a., the Board added language that, “but not limited to, *that portion of Sara’s Way to access the Subject Property, the shared common/private driveway that serves the project...*”

Regarding condition #21, item f., was amended to include the language, “replanted at equal size or at a size equal to that of the original installation per the Approved Plan or as determined by a Registered Landscape Architect...”

The Board amended the beginning of Condition #24 to read “Prior to the start of construction...”

Regarding condition #25, Attorney Eichman noted that the special permits will require compliance with the plans. There are conditions that the project must be built in accordance with the plans. If the project is not completed, the applicant could be required to come in and modify the approvals. Attorney Eichman and Attorney Silverstein agreed to work on wording for this item for the Board to review.

Regarding condition #27, the Board changed “4 years,” to “3 years.”

In terms of condition #34, Ms. Lazarow noted that, based on other recent payments made to the Sidewalk Fund such as from the Enclave site, the 300’ of frontage for this site x \$38 = \$11,400, instead of the \$10,000 listed in this condition. She believes the amount should be kept similar for all approvals. Mr. Barbadoro agreed but noted that the proportion of development between this project and the Enclave project is not equivalent. Mr. Roy stated that the applicant is willing to make a payment of \$6,000 to this Fund. Attorney Silverstein stated that he believes the \$6,000 number came from a calculation from the previous Town Planner. More than this amount would be a financial hardship for the applicant.

Ms. Markowitz noted that the site plan Rules and Regulations Section 4.7 indicates that sidewalks shall be provided along the road frontage, where required by the Board. There was a previous discussion about a sidewalk within the development, which the applicant stated may not be necessary. Also, under Section 4.5, projects located along Route 111 may be required to construct a sidewalk or make a payment to the Sidewalk Fund. \$10,000 was the number floated for this payment in a previous discussion.

Ms. Verner agreed that there should be a set calculation made for each of these payments. Ms. Connolly noted that it costs much more than \$38 per linear foot to put in a sidewalk along Route 111. If the Board is looking to incentivize sidewalks, it should not accept a payment far less than it will need to spend to have a sidewalk built in a separate location. This is a disincentive. She believes the Board needs to think about this more broadly.

Attorney Silverstein stated that this conversation almost punishes smaller developments. Mitigation payments are supposed to be made to compensate a community for adverse impacts. In this case, it does not seem to make sense to place sidewalks in this area, yet the applicant is being punished by being asking to contribute a high payment into a Fund to create sidewalks in a different area of Town which has no nexus to this project.

Ms. Markowitz suggested that the Board keep the \$10,000 number in this condition. The Board agreed and noted that there needs to be a set calculation used for this payment going forward.

The Board added the wording, “Prior to the final Certificate of Occupancy,...” to condition #5, and struck condition #35.

The Board struck the last sentence in condition #36, “The Board reserves the right to require additional measures prior to the final occupancy if the screening is deemed inadequate based on the site inspection.”

Attorney Silverstein noted that the last sentence of condition #38 (“If such noise measurements reflect noise levels at the lot line are above that allowed for “Residential Use” pursuant to the table in Section 6404 (1) of the Zoning Bylaw, the Applicant shall install a noise mitigation fence or utilize other methods to ensure that noise levels at the property line are in compliance with the table in Section 6404 (1) and shall provide such noise measurements to demonstrate compliance.”) was only recently added. He has a concern with a small development such as this being potentially required to put in a noise mitigation fence due to existing conditions over which the applicant has no control. This seems punitive and financially infeasible.

Ms. Markowitz noted that the noise requirements identify different noise limits for industrial uses adjacent to a business district versus residential. This parcel will be changing in use from business to residential, so the noise threshold decreases as a result. This is a chance to mitigate the impact from the abutter. Other means could possibly include a vegetative buffer instead.

Ms. Verner added that she has a concern that neighboring parcels may be devalued in changing how they operate. Operations should not be devalued just because a residential use is being introduced here.

Attorney Silverstein noted that there is a business lot which his client will be maintaining between this parcel and any other abutting business. No other business will have a boundary with any residential levels. This includes Mark White’s property, as there is a right of way in-between them. There is no adjacent residential use, so this item does not apply.

Attorney Eichman stated that he is a little uncomfortable with how this item addresses the situation. He cannot tell the Board to prohibit this, but the zoning bylaw will continue to operate as it should in terms of this item. This will be a difficult part of the condition to apply and enforce.

Mr. Barbadoro agreed with getting a baseline reading on this property, as this will help protect both the business and the new residences.

The Board agreed to strike the last sentence from condition #38.

Regarding condition #40, the Board replaced “250 feet (or greater?)” with the following language, “...all entities located within *the distance as required by State and/or federal law...*”

Regarding condition #42, Ms. Verner asked that the chain link fence along Route 111 be added. Mr. Roy asked if the additional certified arborist was still then required to verify where the trees are located. The tree protection area is shown on the plans, so he is unsure why this needs to then be verified, especially if a chain link fence is going to be required. He noted that he has never used a chain link fence for tree protection before. Ms. Verner stated that this area of the site is very tight to the detention area.

The Board added the language, “Tree protection along Route 111 shall include a temporary 6’ tall chain link fence and shall not be adjusted from what is reflected in the Approved Plans, unless deemed necessary by PLACES Associates and shall be there for duration of the project,” to the end of condition #42. It also removed the second sentence from that condition.

Ms. Carter suggested that condition #45 be amended to include the following language, “Use of recycled materials meeting Mass DOT’s specifications not sourced from demolition is allowed.”

The Board amended condition #46 to include the language, “Parking along Sara’s Way is not allowed.”

The Board amended condition #52 to read:

“The Applicant shall comply with the recommendations from the Design Review Board, pursuant to their report dated April 7, 2022.”

The Board added the language, “...or Negative Determination of Applicability...” to condition #56.

Mr. Roy noted that there needs to be access to the lot that is not being developed via a curb cut. Mr. Barbadoro stated that the original special permit does not allow for this. The applicant would need to amend the original permit in order to do so. Ms. Markowitz stated that this is in the 04-01 decision. The Board amended condition #54 to add, “...absent a modification of Special Permit 04-01...”

The Board discussed condition #61. Mr. Lewandowski noted that, in the future, owners of these units may wish to use the basement space for living area. This condition could make owners seek to do this illegally, instead of through a building permit process. Mr. Barbadoro stated that there needs to be some mechanism to keep these units moderately priced. Ms. Lazarow stated that this could increase the resale price to make them no longer moderately priced.

Mr. Roy stated that he believes condition #62 is to make sure these are not 3-bedroom units, however, he believes this is a Board of Health issue. Mr. Barbadoro stated that his argument for this item is the social and community needs served by the project. Attorney Silverstein stated that he believes this condition is very restrictive and that there are other ways to restrict these units to 2-bedrooms. Requiring this area to be a wide-open space looking down to the first floor is very

prescriptive from a design standpoint. He explained that he believes having six units that are 2,200 s.f. on one property is a benefit over having a “McMansion” on the property. A lot of cost is being imposed on the applicant through these conditions. Some of the conditions are becoming more onerous than when they were originally proposed. The social and community needs are being fulfilled through the types of units being proposed by the applicant.

Ms. Markowitz stated that the Enclave duplex units are around 2,400-2,500 s.f. and selling for close to \$1M. She asked if the applicant has some other way to distinguish these units to be “moderately priced.”

Ms. Lazarow noted that many people are working from home nowadays. It seems impractical to not allow the study to become closed off, without making it a bedroom.

The Board reworded condition #62 to read, “Any study located on the second floor shall be designed in a manner to prevent its use as a bedroom as determined by the Building Inspector.”

Attorney Silverstein stated that the location is likely going to impact the price of these units. The applicant cannot change the real estate market, and what a moderately sized unit will sell for in Boxborough. These will be moderately priced, as compared to a 5-bedroom McMansion on this sized lot, and he believes this is a benefit to the Town.

Ms. Verner asked if there is any other method to ensure these are moderately priced. Mr. Barbadoro stated that a benefit to the community is important to find.

The Board took a straw poll vote on condition #64 and decided to strike it.

The Board reworded condition #72 to read, “Operation and Maintenance of Sara’s Way, including plowing and stormwater management, shall be the responsibility of the current and future owners of the Project and will be reflected in a future agreement.”

The Board revisited the issue of the width of the road.

Ms. Lazarow moved that the curb radius be 30’ and the maximum width of the paved road be 30’, up until the position that it reduces to 16’. Ms. Markowitz seconded.

Discussion:

Mr. Roy stated that whatever the Board agrees on, Mass DOT will capitulate to, based on previous comments. The residential driveway standard, per Mass DOT, is a 24’ paved width, with 30’ radii. The applicant does not agree with reducing it from what it has been for the past number of years.

Ms. Lazarow asked if the area will work at 30’ or 24’ wide. She asked if the Mass DOT standard takes into account the commercial use of this site.

Mr. Roy stated that the area will probably work at 30' wide. The applicant is willing to agree to this.

Ms. Verner stated that the Board will be creating a precedent by allowing something it has not for any other project. She also noted that this is why the Board requests these types of studies.

Ms. Lazarow stated that this is a unique situation, and she is unsure if it sets a precedence.

Ms. Markowitz stated that she has not been convinced that 24' wide won't work.

Ms. Verner noted that the special permit calls for this area to be reduced to a 24' width. There needs to be a balance to allow this type of a use change for this property.

Mr. Barbadoro suggested that the width change to 24' with a 4-6' mail access area, with a total of 30' wide pavement, including shoulders. Ms. Lazarow stated that the end result is still a 30' road. This is a distinction without a difference.

Roll call: Barbadoro – nay; Connolly – aye; Lazarow – aye; Verner – nay; and Markowitz – aye. Motion passed.

The Board amended condition #70 to read, “The Applicant/Owner shall improve Sara’s Way up to the entrance of the proposed Common Driveway to the specifications required under the Design Standards (Section IV), with the exception of a turning radii of 30 feet at the entrance and a paved roadway width of 30 feet, and Required Improvements for an Approved Subdivision (Section V) of the Town of Boxborough Rules and Regulations Governing the Subdivision of Land and in accordance with the requirements specified by the Massachusetts Department of Transportation.”

Attorney Silverstein stated that this proposal creates a use for a very underutilized site. This will allow for six units of modestly sized housing. This will generate more tax revenue for the community. The units have bedrooms on the first floor, which will allow for the elderly or disabled to consider purchasing them. Denying the permit would allow for the unsightly site to remain.

Attorney Eichman noted that, if the Board changes the layout lines for the property, a subdivision plan will be necessary, but an ANR plan will likely also be needed. He has not reviewed the prior subdivision certificate of approval and is not yet clear if there is a strict condition regarding the pavement width. If there is not, it can simply be a condition of this approval.

Attorney Silverstein stated that the road was constructed as shown on the subdivision plan. That subdivision road was constructed adjacent to a driveway that served the existing business, so that the two together form the current pavement width. That existing driveway was not part of the subdivision plan. This condition would require the applicant to tear up part of the driveway that

existed before the subdivision road. He does not believe any modification is required to the subdivision approval, because the driveway was not part of that approval.

Ms. Carter stated that the driveway did not become the right of way for Sara's Way. The decision stated a 22' roadway. She does not believe the owner ever narrowed the pavement width when this decision was made.

Attorney Eichman noted that if the subdivision road as approved was constructed as approved, the fact that other things were added later would likely not require an amendment to the approval. He would like to review the original documents before making a determination.

Ms. Lazarow moved to approve the application for site plan approval for 984 and 996 Massachusetts Avenue & 38 Sara's Way under Section 8007, subject to the conditions agreed upon. Ms. Connolly seconded.

Roll call: Barbadoro – aye; Connolly – aye; Lazarow – aye; Verner – aye; and Markowitz – aye. Motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Markowitz moved to approve the Special Permit for Alternate Access for 984 and 996 Massachusetts Avenue & 38 Sara's Way, subject to proposed conditions. Ms. Lazarow seconded. Roll call: Barbadoro – aye; Connolly – aye; Lazarow – aye; Verner – aye; and Markowitz – aye. Motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Markowitz moved to approve the Special Permit for Residential Uses in the B1 District for 984 and 996 Massachusetts Avenue & 38 Sara's Way, subject to proposed conditions. Ms. Lazarow seconded.

Roll call: Barbadoro – aye; Connolly – aye; Lazarow – aye; Verner – aye; and Markowitz – aye. Motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Markowitz moved to approve the Special Permit for Private/Common Driveway in the B1 District for 984 and 996 Massachusetts Avenue & 38 Sara's Way, subject to proposed conditions. Ms. Lazarow seconded.

Roll call: Barbadoro – aye; Connolly – aye; Lazarow – aye; Verner – aye; and Markowitz – aye. Motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Markowitz moved to close the public hearing for 984 and 996 Massachusetts Avenue & 38 Sara's Way. Ms. Connolly seconded.

Roll call: Barbadoro – aye; Connolly – aye; Lazarow – aye; Verner – aye; and Markowitz – aye. Motion passed unanimously.

Administrative Business – ALL OTHER BUSINESS WAS TABLED TO THE NEXT MEETING

Meeting Minutes – May 2, 2022

Correspondence and New Business (if any)

Technical Assistance Program Grant Application and other Grant Opportunities

American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) projects

95 & 105 Sargent Road, Chapter 61 Notice

Town Center/Enclave Project

Campanelli Campus development options

Planning Board Training

Master Plan Action Items Spreadsheet

Website update

Legislative Update:

- **Housing Choice legislation update / MBTA Communities Regulations Warrant Articles and Town Meeting**

Town Administrator Search Committee Representative

Introduction to new Town Planner

Follow up with Consulting Engineer on debris pile near 1034/1082 Mass Ave.

Committee Reports:

Water Resource Committee (Barbadoro)

Community Preservation Committee (Lazarow)

Economic Development Committee (White)

MAGIC Representative (Markowitz)

The Board thanked Ms. Lazarow for her service.

Ms. Markowitz moved to adjourn the meeting at 12:33 am. Ms. Connolly seconded.

Roll call: Barbadoro – aye; Connolly – aye; Lazarow – aye; Verner – aye; and Markowitz – aye.

Motion passed unanimously.

Meeting Documents:

984 and 996 Massachusetts Avenue & 38 Sara's Way Draft Decision May 2022

Memo from Dillis & Roy, re: Response to Comments, Granite Hill, May 10, 2022

Site Plans 984 Massachusetts Avenue, May 10, 2022

Permit Criteria Checklist

Planning Board Agenda May 16, 2022

Planting Plan, May 11, 2022

Draft Planning Board meeting minutes May 2, 2022

This meeting was conducted via Remote Participation, pursuant to the Current Executive Order.

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81409207345?pwd=NHAzdGtMRGUwdCtZaFNLa2d6MmU2UT09>

Meeting ID: 814 0920 7345

Passcode: 515817

One tap mobile+19292056099,,81409207345# US (New York)+13017158592,,81409207345#
US (Washington,DC)