



## 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 August 30, 2021

### Meeting Minutes

**August 9, 2021**

**7:00 PM**

### Remote Meeting

**Members Present:** Mark Barbadoro (Chair), Cindy Markowitz (Clerk), Mark White, Rebecca Verner, and Robin Lazarow

**Also Present:** Simon Corson (Town Planner), Sue Carter (PLACES Associates), members of applicant teams, Bethany Ordnung (Haley Ward), Michael Sauda (Haley Ward), Adam Costa, Town special land use counsel.

Mr. Barbadoro called the meeting to order at 7:01 PM.

**Public Comment** – none at this time.

The Board conducted other business until the time of the first scheduled public hearing, 7:15pm.

### **Administrative Business**

#### **Meeting Minutes**

Ms. Verner moved to approve the meeting minutes of June 28, 2021, as amended. Seconded by Ms. Lazarow.

Roll call: Barbadoro – aye; Lazarow – aye; Verner – aye; White – aye; and Markowitz – aye.  
Unanimously passed

The Board agreed to review minutes from July 12, July 19, and August 9, at its next meeting.

**Correspondence and New Business (if any)** – none at this time.

#### **Town Center/Enclave Project**

Sue Carter, PLACES Associates, consulting town engineer, stated that there was a recent flood watch in the area and the Enclave site was controlled via sandbags. Due to this mitigation, the water did not spill down to the catch basins located at Sheriff's Meadow. She believes the owner is getting things under control for future heavy rain flows. There is also progress being made to keep the plantings on site alive. There has been an issue getting enough siding and some of the roof runoff cannot be properly controlled until the siding is completed.

In response to a question from Ms. Markowitz regarding landscaping around the Birons' house, Ms. Carter explained that ivy was planted between the flat rocks on the site to help with some

infiltration in lesser storms. Ms. Carter stated that the Birones had originally not wanted trees planted on the hill behind the house. There has been some erosion in that area. It is believed the Birones did not want trees planted because they may end up falling in heavy winds.

Ms. Markowitz asked if some of the trees along the fence and the ivy would be replaced. Ms. Carter cautioned patience as many plants right now are not doing well because of the rain.

In response to a question from Ms. Verner, Ms. Carter stated that the first items to be planted in this area, the green giant arborvitae along the top of the fence line, may still be under warranty. She will revisit this in September with a site walk to look at plantings.

### **7:15 PM Priest Lane**

**Owner/Applicant: Boxborough Town Center LLC**

**Definitive Subdivision Plan Application**

Mr. Barbadoro opened the public hearing and read the legal notice.

Greg Roy, Dillis & Roy, joined the Board, representing the applicant. He explained that, since the previous meeting, he has issued a revised plan set with a cover letter dated August 2, 2021, that reviews the revisions. These revisions include a soil test completed on July 22, 2021, lot regularity triangles added to the lot layout sheet, abutter labels added to the lot layout sheet, driveway grades added to the plans, notes added regarding high points of the driveways, and an updated project narrative. He stated that he looked at the runoff questions raised by the Board during the last meeting. The proposed runoff not captured by the catch basins will not be exceeding the pre-development runoff amounts. The applicant is now proposing a catch basin at the flow entrance into Priest Lane from the proposed driveway that will then be piped into the catch basin. It will be better to intercept the surface water in that position and then discharge it below grade. He spoke with both Ms. Carter and the DPW Director about this plan because this is a Town road, and both were okay with the proposal. Notes regarding this item were also updated on the plan.

Mr. Roy asked if Town Counsel has any opinion yet regarding the original Priest Lane subdivision approval conditions and their impact on this proposal.

Adam Costa, Town special land use counsel, noted that he has reviewed much of the history of these properties and subdivisions. He stated that it does not appear that the parcel in question was part of the land submitted in 1999 for original subdivision approval. The parcel was shown on the plan, but with a separate owner. It is identified on the plan, much in the same way other abutters would be. He does not believe that the Board is required to modify the 1999 original subdivision approval as part of this application because the land in question was separate and distinct. There was an express acknowledgement in the 2019 settlement agreement of the provision between the Town and developer to allow two single-family dwellings in this rezoned area. To the extent that the Board's concerns are regarding Priest Lane for accessibility to this lot, the 1999 approval makes it clear that the only way to access it is via Priest Lane. He stated that he believes the Board can examine this application as its own subdivision on its own merits.

In response to a question from Mr. Barbadoro regarding preservation of stone walls on site, Mr. Costa stated that the original subdivision plan shows that all contractors will adhere to stone wall preservation measures. The Board could include conditions that reference these plans showing the stone walls on site to be preserved. It seems unclear that the Board could require the applicant to amend a previous subdivision approval that was issued for a separate parcel of land owned by someone else.

In response to a question from Mr. Barbadoro regarding the Board staying silent on this item, Mr. Costa stated that the Board always has the right to stay silent on items. This could be an issue for debate at a later time though, by either the Town or the owner.

Mr. Roy stated that, as this subdivision was not included as part of the original application for the Priest Lane subdivision, it ought to be afforded all of the privileges allowed to other applicants in situations where subdivisions were applied for off Town roads.

In response to a question from Ms. Markowitz regarding which stone wall on site is proposing to be cut, Mr. Roy explained that that the wall in question is part of the driveway access to Lot C4. The proposal looks to modify that stone wall as required for grading of the site, and then put the wall back as best it can be.

The Board and Mr. Costa discussed that this stone wall does appear to be part of the right of way. The Board could allow for modification of the stone wall as a condition, notwithstanding the language of the original subdivision approval.

Ms. Carter suggested that the Board could condition the applicant to reuse the stones removed from the stone wall to build a new wall on site.

Mr. White noted that the Board appears to be able to recommend that the applicant retain as much of the stone wall as possible, but that it cannot require the applicant to keep the stone wall.

In response to a question from Ms. Markowitz regarding the roadway width, Mr. Roy explained that the pavement width, after rounding, is proposed to be 16'. The applicant is proposing approximately 30-35' of stone wall removal but will plan to reuse these stones and round them into the site.

In response to a question from Ms. Verner, Mr. Roy explained that there are currently no proposed plantings to hide the rest of the stone wall. The applicant is proposing to remove more of the stone wall than a typical driveway due to the grade of the area. The applicant will be sensitive to the aesthetics of the area and use the removed stones for roundings.

Ms. Verner asked if this road is proposed to be a dead-end street, as it appears to be one by definition. If it is, she then questioned the length of the driveway, as it should not exceed 500' in length unless there is a benefit to the Town or a compelling argument to allow it.

Mr. Roy explained that the pavement within the right of way to be created will allow for a circular area for two lots to have frontage. This will echo the Priest Lane geometry for its cul-de-sacs. The cul-de-sac will create the necessary frontage and all for construction of fully compliant public street cul-de-sacs. The length of the area in question, from the edge of the Priest Lane cul-de-sac, is approximately 179' to the back cul-de-sac. There is a waiver proposed to allow the applicant not to construct this to the full width pavement required, but instead to meet the shared driveway standards in order to keep this entrance looking like a residential shared driveway. The overall length of the road to the proposed houses is not considered part of the full street length, as it diverges into a single-family driveway.

Ms. Carter stated that, per the subdivision regulations, the road in question is an extension of Priest Lane. Priest Lane was originally approved to be 793'. Adding 150' to this length would make the road a total of 943'. Mr. Roy agreed and stated that a waiver will be requested for this item. The waiver is to allow this area to look like a single-family driveway for the two proposed homes. This roadway is only for the two houses, and not for use by Priest Lane residents or the Town. The applicant will be requesting waivers for the road construction standards and the single access street length.

Ms. Verner explained that, to grant the waiver, the applicant must present a compelling argument. She noted that the Planning Board may look more favorably on granting these waivers if the applicant would consider preserving part of the property in a wooded state.

In response to a question from Ms. Markowitz, Mr. Roy noted that this does appear to be classified as a dead-end street and that there will be a waiver submitted to extend the length of the access street. Ms. Markowitz asked why the narrative does not explain this as a dead-end. Mr. Roy stated that this will be addressed in the future.

Ms. Markowitz agreed with Ms. Verner that the Board may want to find some means of mitigating these waivers in a way that is beneficial to the Town.

In response to a question from Ms. Verner, Mr. Roy stated that the two lots are proposed to be large, oversized lots. Part of each of these lots is located in the Town Center district, and part of each is located in the Agriculture-Residential district. He stated that he will revisit turning over some of each of the lots to the Town in exchange for granting the waivers.

In response to a question from Ms. Markowitz, Mr. Roy noted that Parcel X is the exact size of the drainage easement for the Enclave project. This parcel will be conveyed to the Enclave project as part of this subdivision plan.

Mr. White noted that he believes the mitigation as part of this project could be simply that the applicant is not proposing a wide subdivision roadway that only services two lots and is not planning to further subdivide these two lots. He stated that the applicant has already gone to lengths to give the Town the development that the Board wanted to see. It was always known that this would be an extension of the roadway for this subdivision.

Mr. Roy also noted that the Enclave project originally proposed 100 units off Priest Lane but, through a settlement agreement, modified this to 50 units. The applicant also reserved the right to develop two single-family homes on this property.

In response to a question from Ms. Verner regarding if the settlement agreement described how the houses were to be located on this property, Mr. Costa stated that the only reference to the development of this property is on page 12 of the agreement.

The Board discussed what could be done with the back area of the property if it was to be given to the Town. Ms. Carter noted that this area is not currently vegetated; it is used as a stockpile of materials for the Enclave project.

Mr. Costa stated that the Board has the same authority here as with any other subdivision approval. If it seeks mitigation of some sort, it should tie this to the public interest. The Board can ask the applicant for mitigation in exchange for waivers, as long as it ties this to the relief being sought.

Ms. Markowitz noted that a couple of current Board members were fully supportive of the zoning change from Town Center district to Agricultural-Residential district in this area. The Board knew this project would come before it eventually but some of the land within the property is still zoned Town Center district and thus there is some concern that not making provisions on this land for the benefit of the Town could have negative consequences.

Mr. Barbadoro asked for public comment.

Barbara Salzman asked if the applicant might consider net zero houses for this development, as a way to help mitigate fossil fuels. Mr. Roy stated that he would discuss this with the applicant but does not believe the applicant will be okay with building anything other than the “greenest” homes as outlined within the building code.

Ms. Carter noted that there are drainage issues with this property that need to be resolved.

The Board discussed the timeline for continuing this hearing.

Ms. Verner moved to continue this public hearing to August 30, 2021, at 7:15pm, via Zoom. Ms. Markowitz seconded.

Roll call: Barbadoro – aye; Lazarow – aye; Verner – aye; White – aye; and Markowitz – aye. Unanimously passed.

**7:30 PM – 1414 Massachusetts Avenue**

**Owner: LPCH Boxborough**

**Applicant: Arranta Bio**

**Site Plan Approval Application**

Mr. Barbadoro recused himself as an abutter to this application.

Ms. Markowitz stepped in to Chair this hearing. She read the legal notice and opened the hearing. She noted that she will be proposing a hard stop on discussion of this topic at 10pm.

Paul Alphen, Alphen & Santos, P.C.; Richard Quinby, Arranta Bio; Karisa Hanson, Arranta Bio, Mark Bamforth, Arranta Bio; Jim Noonan, Lincoln Properties; and Nick Facendola, Level Design Group joined the Board.

Paul Alphen explained that the applicant has submitted additional information regarding this proposal, dated August 3, 2021. This includes information regarding compliance with the new zoning and Board of Health regulations, an amended and updated site plan application, an updated traffic study, information regarding the joint agreement between the two tenants for the third-party waste transfer company and information regarding the temporary removal of a part of the façade – which is not subject to site plan review. He requested that the hearing remain open during deliberations so that the participant is able to discuss potential conditions.

In response to a question from Ms. Markowitz, Mr. Quinby stated that two of the above items were only submitted to the Board today.

Ms. Markowitz stated that the Board has not yet heard from the Board of Health regarding this application and that no members of the Board of Health are attending the meeting tonight. She asked if this application will also comply with the newly adopted Hazardous Materials bylaw. Mr. Alphen stated that this item will not impact the project and thus it was not addressed.

Mr. Quinby noted that the applicant plans to create an opening in the existing building in order to move manufacturing modules in and will then close the opening and make it match the existing façade. He stated that this item is not subject to site plan review and is exempt under sections *8003 Exemptions - The following shall not require site plan approval: (1) In an Industrial-Commercial or Office Park District construction, alteration or expansion of a building, provided that such building shall not have a gross floor area in excess of (500) square feet or a proposed expansion of ten (10) percent of the existing gross floor area, including the basement, if applicable; and 8004 Substantial Alteration - For purposes of this Section 8000, substantial alteration to a building means an alteration of a single building or a group of buildings under one ownership on the same lot or contiguous lots that results in an increase in gross floor area of either five hundred (500) square feet or ten (10) percent of the existing gross floor area, whichever is less. The calculation of substantial alteration shall be determined based upon the aggregate of all expansions undertaken within a consecutive five-year period. Substantial alteration to areas for parking, loading or vehicular access shall mean a change in the layout or location of parking spaces, an increase in pavement area of more than three hundred (300) square feet, or any relocation, addition or change in driveways. Resurfacing shall not be construed as a substantial alteration unless it involves a change of surface material.*

Mr. Quinby stated that the third-party entity will be singularly responsible for the waste fed into a joint system and trucked offsite from both tenants. This third party will be hired out by Arranta

Bio and Vibalogics and will take possession of the necessary equipment, maintenance of the equipment, and trucking it offsite.

In response to a question from Ms. Markowitz, Mr. Costa stated that this relationship will be between the two tenants and the third party, and whatever other third parties are hired for the process. He does not believe it is within the Board's purview to be involved in these relationships. He likened the process to that of a condo association. A condo association is generally responsible for items occurring within it, such as maintaining drainage, etc., and may engage third parties to help with these items. The third parties or consultants are not responsible to the Town if anything goes wrong; the condo association is responsible. Similarly, the applicant in this case is ultimately responsible for the system in place. The Board can require a copy of any agreements between parties of this application and/or copies of contracts with third party vendors, but ultimately any potential enforcement would be pursued against the applicant.

In response to a question from Ms. Markowitz regarding possible catastrophic failures of the system, Mr. Costa stated that the Board, if still under subdivision approval enforcement, can require the applicant to fix items. If there is a larger catastrophic failure, there are State and Federal mechanisms in place to look to those involved as responsible parties.

Ms. Ordnung stated that Haley Ward will be sending a follow-up letter regarding any outstanding concerns it has.

Ms. Carter stated that she has no further comments on the application.

Ms. Verner stated that she has a concern with the fact that the Building Commissioner has not yet provided a determination on this application. She asked if the applicant plans to submit a full list of hazardous materials to the Board for review. She stated that she has a concern regarding water consumption on site and the potential depletion of the aquifer. She questioned if Arranta Bio would consider being obligated to a certain number of gallons per day usage in their application. She also noted that the two businesses, Arranta Bio and Vibalogics, are proposing to use less than half of the parking currently on site and questioned if there would be a benefit to reducing the amount of parking on site.

Mr. Alphen stated that the Building Commissioner determined in his letter that it is not his place to issue a determination on this application. It seemed that the Building Commissioner was leaving the decision up to the Planning Board or until a full application is in front of him for review. The applicant assumed that the Building Commissioner would review this through the building permit application process, which cannot happen until this process is approved by the Planning Board.

Ms. Markowitz asked for public comment.

Jim Comolli, 451 Sargent Road, stated that there are two levels of risks for waste streams: pre- and post-activation. The concern should be in making sure that there is an emergency plan in place for the business and that there is training of staff in case any issues arise. He noted that

Arranta Bio is a contract manufacturer and so could be hired to manufacture different things over time. He stated that it will be important for the permitting process to be updated yearly to discuss any changes to what is being manufactured.

In response to a question from Mr. Comolli, Karisa Hanson stated that the solid biohazardous waste on site will be handled by Triumvirate Environmental. The EPA and MA DEP have regulations that must be followed in terms of waste streams and handling of them. Employee safety training is offered. All solid biohazardous waste on site is recycled. Hazardous wastes are collected within the lab space and shipped off via Triumvirate; none of this waste goes into the wastewater system.

Mr. Alphen noted that nothing goes down the drain on site except for domestic waste.

Mr. Quinby stated that Arranta Bio is a validated GMP facility (good manufacturing practice). The BioKill system will also be validated. There will be double containment as required on site. He noted that the CDMO (contract development & manufacturing) will all be governed by the Board of Health. There will be a biosafety committee that will review anything new being brought into the facility. The Board of Health will have a seat on this committee and thus there will be full transparency to this process.

Ms. Markowitz questioned having a separate Town biosafety committee, in addition to the IBC (Institutional Biosafety Committee). Ms. Hanson stated that Watertown created its own town biosafety committee that includes two Board of Health members and community members to help advise the process. This committee is a subset of the town's Board of Health and started hearing applications in early 2021. Arranta Bio submitted a completed application and received the biosafety permit from the committee at the end of April 2021. Ms. Hanson noted that, instead of an additional Town biosafety committee, Boxborough has decided to appoint two Board of Health members to the IBC.

Mark Bamforth explained that Watertown took this route because it had approximately 50 biotech companies coming into town at that time.

Mark Barbadoro, Old Harvard Road, asked if the IBC meetings are public meetings. He also noted a concern regarding the modestly sized storage tank for hazardous materials that both companies plan to use. He questioned what happens if the tank becomes full. He also agreed with putting a conditions on the project for it to meet the zoning bylaw regarding hazardous materials used in an incidental manner. He spoke with the Building Commissioner on this project, who noted that he would not respond to the determination without first having all the facts.

Ms. Hanson stated that the IBC meetings are internal. Boxborough will have one Board of Health member and one community member appointed by the Board of Health to the IBC. The minutes of these meetings are submitted to the Board of Health and are public documents that the Board of Health can make available to others. She explained that the Boxborough Board of Health permit application will require a list of all hazardous materials to use on site.

Mr. Bamforth stated that the BioKill system holding tank is 5,000 gallons, and the holding tank system is 9,000 gallons. There will be alarms on the tanks, as shown in all the design drawings. If the tanks are alerted to be almost full, controls are in place to hold processes until the tanks are emptied. This would be abnormal because of the amount of waste being produced and the size of the tanks.

In response to a question from Ms. Markowitz regarding the safety of mixing waste stream from different companies, Mr. Quinby explained that the waste streams are not radically different between the two companies. There will be an agreement with Vibalogics to review all materials coming onto the site. These are not chemicals but mostly salt and water. There will be constant communication between the two companies about what's being processed on site.

Mr. Comolli asked if the Town's IBC representative will have an ability to do anything more than hear information on the committee. He asked if the proprietary information of the company will be disclosed to the public. He also asked about the differences between the Watertown facility and the one proposed in Boxborough.

Ms. Hanson stated that the two community representatives to the IBC in Watertown both have signed nondisclosure agreements, as they both work for other biotech companies. The IBC in Watertown does discuss proprietary information and she assumes the one in Boxborough will do the same.

Mr. Bamforth stated that the Watertown and proposed Boxborough facility are similar. The key difference is in the height restrictions. The Watertown facility has approximately 2,000-liter scale bioreactors. Boxborough will have approximately 5,000-liter scale bioreactors. He noted that Arranta Bio's customers will approach the company with certain requirements and the company will decide if it can do the work. The project will then need IBC clearance and a contract in place.

In response to a question from Ms. Markowitz, Mr. Quinby stated that neither of Arranta Bio's facilities have ever had any regulation violations.

Jim Noonan explained that he is uncertain what the long-term future of the facility will be, and is, thus, not probably interested at this time in reducing the amount of parking on site. This will be discussed internally.

Ms. Markowitz noted that the Watertown facility did discuss possibly reviewing the amount of parking on site.

Mr. White stated that the building owner already has this amount of parking on site and is unsure if these tenants will be staying into the long-term future. He stated that it is unclear why the owner would reduce existing parking at this time.

Mr. White stated that he has concerns regarding the IBC being comprised of two members of the Town of Boxborough/appointed by the Board of Health, but not necessarily general members of

the public. He is concerned regarding how the IBC will continue to be informed about concerns of the Town, and how the IBC will continue to inform the Town about the company. He noted that the withdrawal of water by the company is limited by the Board of Health regulations, and he is unsure if the Planning Board can specify anything beyond that.

Mr. Costa stated that there are nine criteria for the issuance of site plan approval. Some are all-encompassing and some allow the Board a range of discretion. Two of these relate to water: one regarding subsurface and groundwater, and the other regarding adequate facilities supplied for water on site. He noted that the Board should be mindful that water withdrawal on site is the purview of the Board of Health. If the Planning Board can relate concerns regarding the water discharge on site to the operation of the site, it might have some discretion.

Ms. Salzman stated that only having two representatives on the IBC leaves the Town in a minority to the industry representatives on the committee. She believes it would be prudent for the Town to have a separate biosafety committee.

Ms. Verner noted that the June 10, 2021, memo from Level Design Group lists eight possible waivers that the applicant is seeking relief from. The Board agreed that this list could be highlighted, put on the Town website, and reviewed by Board members. The Board also agreed to compile all questions about this application to send along to the applicant.

The Board discussed creating a small working group to begin to craft a draft decision for this application.

Mr. White moved to continue this hearing to August 30, 2021, at 7:30pm via Zoom. Ms. Lazarow seconded.

Roll call: Lazarow – aye; Verner – aye; White – aye; and Markowitz – aye. Unanimously passed.

In response to a question from Ms. Lazarow regarding how the working group will seek input from other Board members, Mr. Costa noted that the ultimate decision on this application and any possible waivers will come back before the whole Board. Ms. Lazarow stated that she would like Mr. Costa's input on the working draft decision.

Mr. Barbadoro took his place as Chair.

### **Administrative Business**

#### **Zoning Bylaw Recodification options**

Ms. Markowitz stated that the Town received one proposal from the RFP from Barrett Planning Group.

Mr. Corson stated that the proposal made matches the RFP and the anticipated services. This will use all of the allocated funds voted on at Town Meeting. The Town Administrator's Office has noted some extra funds in the Legal Services budget line that can be used to review the recodification document once drafted.

In response to a question from Ms. Verner, Ms. Markowitz explained that the original proposal from Barrett Planning Group was for \$25,000. The Town then bolstered its RFP with some extra meetings, which increased the current proposal to \$30,000.

In response to a question from Ms. Verner, Mr. Corson stated that the Town reached out to all three vendors to let them know the RFP was going to be released. All three were also contacted to be sure they received the RFP.

In response to a question from Mr. Barbadoro, Mr. Corson stated that the first draft of the document will be the most difficult. Board members and Town staff will compile and questions and issues to be discussed during the iterative process.

Mr. Corson noted that the Board could take up this process during one of its public meetings or could hold a separate work session. Ms. Markowitz stated that the intent is to have this completed for Annual Town Meeting in May 2022.

The Board agreed to move forward with this project.

**Cisco/Beaver Brook Campus development options** – no updates.

**Re-introduce the Solar Bylaw** – continuing to be worked on.

**Massachusetts General Law, Chapter 148, Section 26H and Section 26I: Sprinklers for Lodging, Boarding Houses and Multiple Dwelling Units** – no updates.

#### **MOU and Town Planner's Job Description**

Mr. Barbadoro stated that the Personnel Board decided to rewrite the Town Planner's job description to fit a template. The Personnel Plan states that any policies and procedures of the Personnel Board must be approved by the Select Board. He cannot find any instances where this has occurred. He noted that the Select Board is uncomfortable because the Planning Board has issues with this item and is also uncomfortable because the Personnel Board does not want its power taken away, however, this is a power that was never afforded to them.

#### **Public Records Request**

Mr. Barbadoro stated that he has had difficulty in getting public records documents of the Select Board and Personnel Board. He questioned if it would cost money for the Planning Board to directly request these documents, and that the Town Clerk stated that this would be up to the Town Administrator.

The Board discussed that the Select Board was concurrently holding its meeting and possibly deliberating on this same topic. The Planning Board thus cannot be there to hear or speak to the item.

Mr. White suggested that Mr. Barbadoro approach the Select Board Chair on this item to see if any answers can be discerned.

Mr. Barbadoro stated that he has received an official resignation letter from the Planning Board alternate. This position will now be advertised for on the Town website and through social media. The deadline for this position will be 30-days.

Mr. Corson explained that there is currently an Interim Building Commissioner in Town. This position currently works less than 30 hours/week and is in the office on Monday and Wednesday. The intent is for the Town to also hire a part-time Building Inspector. The Chairs of the three land use boards in Town will soon begin reviewing the application process. The long-term plan would be to find one person who can do both jobs.

**Committee Reports:**

**Community Preservation Committee (Lazarow)** - no updates at this time.

**Design Review Board (Verner)** – no updates at this time.

**Economic Development Committee (White)** – no updates at this time.

**MAGIC Representative (Markowitz)** –

Ms. Markowitz stated that the new members have been appointed to this committee. She has also forwarded the MAPC newsletter to the Board members regarding new grant listings.

**Water Resources (Barbadoro)** –

Mr. Barbadoro stated that the committee has two property owners that it will reach out to regarding possibly purchasing land for a municipal well.

**LELWD Small Cell Committee (Markowitz)** – no updates at this time.

**Building Committee - TBD** – no updates at this time.

The Board discussed the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA). Mr. Corson stated that the Town has over \$1M in funds to spend to help with COVID-19 relief. Some of this money could go towards allowing for better remote participation for hybrid public meetings in Town.

Mr. Corson explained that an offer from BXB-TV has been accepted for the Planning Board to have live broadcast meetings starting August 30, 2021. This will allow for a member of BXB-TV to be present on all meetings to provide any technical support needed. The cost of this offer is already existing in the BXB-TV contract.

The Board agreed to discuss options to spend the ARPA funds in Town at its next meeting.

Mr. White moved to adjourn the meeting at 11:14pm. Ms. Lazarow seconded.

Roll call: Barbadoro – aye; Lazarow – aye; Verner – aye; White – aye; and Markowitz – aye. Unanimously passed.

**Meeting Documents:**

APPLICATION FOR DEFINITIVE PLAN OF A SUBDIVISION, FOR “PRIEST LANE”, DILLIS & ROY CIVIL DESIGN GROUP, INC., May 21, 2021, revised August 2, 2021

Memo from Dillis & Roy, re: Revised Plan Set, Definitive Subdivision – Priest Lane  
Boxborough, MA 01719, August 2, 2021

Memo from PLACES Associates, re: Priest Lane Definitive Subdivision, July 15, 2021, Revised  
August 5, 2021

Site Plan Approval Application: 1414 & 1320 Massachusetts Avenue; 244A & 244B Adams  
Place; 984, 984A, 984B, 984C, 1451, 1497 & 1634 Hazard Lane; 328 & 1451 Rear Hazard Lane

Memo from Alphen & Santos, P.C., re: Arranta Bio Site Plan Review  
1414 & 1320 Massachusetts Avenue; 244A & 244B Adams Place; 984, 984A, 984B, 984C,  
1451, 1497 & 1634 Hazard Lane; 328 & 1451 Rear Hazard Lane, Boxborough, MA 01719.  
Assessor Parcel Numbers: 12-027, 12-028, 12-030, 13-004, 13-002, 17-005, 17-009, 17- 010, 17-  
022, 17-023, 17-024, 17-025, 18-001. LDG File No. 1869.00, August 3, 2021

Memo from Nitsch Engineering, re: Nitsch Project #12995, July 30, 2021

Draft Meeting Minutes June 28, 2021

Draft Meeting Minutes July 19, 2021

Memo from Barrett Planning Group, LLC, re: Reference: Zoning Bylaw Recodification, August  
2, 2021

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

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84691168569?pwd=UjF1SjdlSlJISUxWVkxrcGhscnVIQT09>

Meeting ID: 846 9116 8569

Passcode: 385283

One tap mobile

+13017158592,,84691168569#,,,,\*385283# US (Washington DC)

+13126266799,,84691168569#,,,,\*385283# US (Chicago)