

BEDFORD PLANNING BOARD
Selectmen's Meeting Room – Town Hall
Regular Session Minutes
September 16, 2014

MEMBERS PRESENT: Shawn Hanegan, Chair;
Jeffrey Cohen, Amy Lloyd, and Lisa Mustapich

MEMBERS ABSENT: Sandra Hackman

STAFF PRESENT: Glenn Garber, Planning Director; Catherine Perry, Assistant Planner; and
Cathy Silvestrone, Planning A.A.

STAFF ABSENT: None

OTHERS PRESENT: See Attached

Chair Hanegan convened the Planning Board meeting at 7:30 PM

Emergency Evacuation notice read by Amy Lloyd, Clerk

Note: All meeting submittals are available for review in the Planning Office.

Chair Hanegan announced the following:

1. **Irene Road** continued Public Hearing Cluster Development Special Permit with Definitive Subdivision Plan that was originally scheduled for this evening has been postponed to Wednesday, October 1st. Attorney Pamela Brown, on behalf of Paul Marcus/Dudley Developers LLC, provided a letter dated, September 11, 2014 granting an extension of time to close the public hearing and render a decision by October 10, 2014 due to a delay in submission of revised plans, as well as convening a voting quorum of the board.

MOTION: Amy Lloyd moved to accept the applicant's letter dated September 11, 2014 granting an extension of time for a decision on the Irene Road Cluster Development Special Permit with Definitive Subdivision Plan. (Jeffrey Cohen seconded the motion)

4-0-0

2. **Subscribe to E-Info.**—Chair Hanegan read a public notice provided by Cathy Silvestrone, Planning AA, stating that the best way for residents and others to stay informed of town board & committee meetings, agendas, and minutes is by subscribing to E-Info. on the town's website.

DEVELOPMENT SESSION

1. **Athena Lane Subdivision**—modification to the Certification of Action; applicant was required to install a new fire hydrant to substitute for a sprinkler system in the rear house (4 Athena Lane) which was conditioned in subdivision approval but was omitted in construction.

Attorney Pamela Brown submitted a letter dated September 8, 2014 requesting a modification of the subdivision approval for Athena Lane. Ms. Brown explained that by an unfortunate mistake, the developer, Homes by Anna, omitted installing a sprinkler system in the rear house at 4 Athena Lane. Ms. Brown pointed out that the developer had installed a water line in the street right of way to support the sprinkler system, which demonstrates an intention to install. Ms. Brown shared that once the developer (Anna Wallace) realized the error; she investigated the cost to correct the situation and learned that it would cost over \$80,000 to install a sprinkler system in an already constructed house. After much discussion between town staff and the applicant, an alternative solution to install a new fire hydrant (at the cost of the developer) was proposed.

Lisa Mustapich and other Board members voiced their discontent regarding the developer's error given that it was clearly stated under *specific conditions* in Planning Board's Certificate of Action that a sprinkler system needed to be installed in the rear-most house.

Jeffrey Cohen stated that although he was disappointed that the developer didn't follow through with the original condition stated in the Certificate of Action, he supports the current request before the Board to allow the developer to provide and install a fire hydrant as proposed instead of installing a sprinkler system in the rear-most house to resolve the issue. Mr. Cohen also commented about the valuable amount of staff time it took to correct the developer's error; and then suggested that the Fire Department get involved earlier in the rough-in inspection process to help to avoid a situation like this in the future.

MOTION: Amy Lloyd moved that the Planning Board accept a request for a modification of Athena Lane Definitive Subdivision approval (signed on June 4, 2013) as stated in a September 8, 2014 letter from Attorney Brown on behalf of Homes by Anna, to allow the developer to install a fire hydrant at the intersection of Athena Lane/Hartwell Road as an alternative solution to installing a sprinkler system at the rear-most residence (4 Athena Lane). (Lisa Mustapich seconded the motion)

VOTE: 4-0-0

BUSINESS SESSION

- 1) General discussion on proposed Greenbelt (etc.) Zoning Amendment—(draft language for a Town Meeting Warrant Article setting out proposed changes to various sections of the Zoning Bylaw was provided—a copy of this language can be found on the Planning page of the Town's website)

Planning Director Garber opened a Board discussion on a proposed Greenbelt Zoning Amendment. Director Garber explained that the existing greenbelt provision in the Zoning Bylaws has a one-size-fits-all philosophy which is no longer practical and almost impossible to achieve. Mr. Garber added that a lot of work is needed to revise this provision.

Catherine Perry, Assistant Planner, explained the changes that she has drafted. She shared information regarding current planting standards in section 6.2.12 (Minimum Lot Landscaping) and the 50 foot perimeter no building rule for Cluster and Planned Residential Developments (PRDs) in sections 8.2.8 and 9.2.5. In particular, Ms. Perry spoke about the wide buffer requirements for developments adjacent to residential districts, regardless of how small a lot is or the nature of the development. The primary standard of planting is four staggered rows of evergreens, ten feet apart and at least eight feet high, which would be nearly fifty feet wide in total. In cluster and planned residential developments, all buildings, including accessory buildings such as garden sheds, are prohibited in a fifty foot strip around the perimeter, which cuts across residents' yards. Ms. Perry shared scenarios when the existing Greenbelt and related provisions can be overly restrictive and inflexible. Planning Director Garber mentioned a specific situation where a homeowner who lives in a cluster subdivision was restricted from building a shed in his backyard because of the required 50' wide perimeter rule which in this case covered approximately 50% of his property. Ms. Perry also spoke about how the imposition of a wide planting buffer requirement on business and mixed use developments can affect the economic use of a property.

Ms. Perry reviewed the proposed new bylaw language and pointed out that these amendments would provide protection with more flexibility throughout various sections of the Zoning Bylaw relating to landscaping, tree protection, and visual screening in development, including changes to the current greenbelt provision and the deletion of the 50' perimeter/no building rule in Cluster and Planned Residential developments. Ms. Perry added that, through the site plan review or discretionary special permit process, buffers could be tailored to fit specific site conditions. The language encourages the creative use of existing landscape assets on the site and provides better protection for these.

Jeffrey Cohen asked for clarification of the term greenbelt versus landscape buffer or visual buffering. Mr. Cohen commented that he believes there may be some confusion between these terms.

Ms. Perry explained that the current bylaw uses the term greenbelt. The new language replaces this with the term landscape buffer for industrial and business development. It distinguishes their treatment from residential (cluster and PRD) developments in sections 8 and 9, where it uses a looser term of visual buffering.

Amy Lloyd raised a question about the proposed text in section 8.3.2.1—conditions; *it states that if a Special Permit is granted, the Planning Board may impose as a condition that the Common land shall be conveyed....etc.* Ms. Lloyd wondered if there was a need for clarification as to who the land is being conveyed to. Ms. Perry replied that she believes that this is explained in the preceding sections of the bylaw (the conveyance may be to the Town or to another suitable organization), but she would verify that.

Jeffrey Cohen asked; if the proposed zoning amendment gets passed at Fall Town Meeting in November, at what point can the bylaw be applied, given that the bylaw language needs to be approved by the Attorney General.

Catherine Perry replied that a zoning bylaw takes effect immediately following Town Meeting. The Board can then act upon an application before them with the notion that most likely the zoning amendment will be approved by the Attorney General. Director Garber added that during this period of time, the developer/property owner would be moving forward at its own risk (if the project relied on the amendment), and that the Board should inform them of that in case the Attorney General denies the amendment.

Lisa Mustapich thanked Ms. Perry for her work; and said that overall the zoning amendment looks good. Ms. Mustapich told Ms. Perry that she appreciated seeing language in the amendment addressing tree protection measures; and noted that the preservation of mature trees helps ease visual impacts.

Jeffrey Cohen asked what happens if a developer plants a visual buffer at an early stage of the development and it becomes deteriorated. Is there any mechanism that the Board can use to require continuous maintenance of the visual barrier? His question included a development that involves a multiphase review and that is required to provide a landscape buffer.

Ms. Perry said that this can be a grey area; however, conditions can be written into the decision of approval, noting that if the required planting in the visual barrier fails within a certain amount of time, then the developer would be expected to replace that planting. Ms. Perry also mentioned that as time goes on it gets more difficult to enforce. Deed restrictions requiring property owners such as homeowners to be responsible for maintaining plantings over the years are a possibility, but might be regarded as a heavy imposition.

Mr. Cohen shared an example of a specific property where several trees were removed and the property owner was asked to re-plant trees. The property owner complied and planted replacement trees however, these trees didn't survive. The property owner never corrected this situation, and then later came forth seeking a special permit for something else, but because the planting situation wasn't property addressed, it became an issue for the property owner to address before moving forward on the special permit request.

Ms. Perry said that if a property owner is returning for something else, this is a good time to revisit and address issues such as buffers.

Mr. Cohen asked: in the case of a large property owner that abuts a residential area, could the Board recommend that the property owner be responsible to maintain its buffer. Mr. Cohen added that it seems as though there is nothing the board/town can do as far as future maintenance of a buffer.

Ms. Perry said that something could be written into a special permit decision for an industrial property stating that the property owner is responsible for the maintenance of its buffer.

Director Garber said that if a site makes maximum use of existing vegetation (including trees, etc.) its own ecosystem tends to endure, but if you took the current greenbelt provision literally, (ex. planting 4-rows of staggered trees and the inclusion of fencing) then most likely the recommended planting would not survive. Mr. Garber said this information has been verified by

many people in the nursery and construction business. Mr. Garber commented that the existing greenbelt bylaw is redundant, artificial and confirms that the one-size fits all standard doesn't work, and added that it is best to stick with the topography and natural features of the land. Mr. Garber further commented that it is incumbent on the Board, as they apply the proposed discretionary buffering bylaw, to ensure that strong conditions are written in decisions to require that buffers are to endure in perpetuity, or for the life of the development, and pointed out that the Board has a lot of discretion throughout the special permit process.

Lisa Mustapich expressed that the advice Director Garber provided was good, and that the Board depends on Planning staff's institutional memory to ensure that enforcement is addressed.

Ms. Perry mentioned that if a developer goes through site plan review, the regulatory powers aren't quite as strong as a special permit process..

Amy Lloyd said she sensed that with the existing greenbelt provision, Cluster development tends to create a roadway leading into a clump of houses that are isolated from everything around. Ms. Lloyd inquired if the proposed amendment would allow more of an extension of a neighborhood.

Ms. Perry spoke about the layouts of cluster developments and how they vary. The shape of the land parcel is one factor. Ms. Perry said the choice of location for the common land (25% open space requirement) also plays a role in which other parts of the land are developed. Developers usually wish to maximize the economics of a parcel, which tends to favor short roads and easy utility connections, but the 50 foot no building rule does affect the layout.

Director Garber voiced that the hope is the proposed zoning greenbelt amendment (if passed) would be a precursor to a future modern OSRD (Open Space Residential Development) bylaw that would eventually replace the old Cluster bylaws. Mr. Garber said that there are much better models out there to explore. Mr. Garber said that the amended landscape provisions pertaining to Clusters & PRD's begin to incorporate the principle of natural resources coming first to create buffers.

Attorney Brown voiced that the existing greenbelt provision is well overdue for a change. Ms. Brown said that she understands the struggles the Board has had with the existing bylaw, and agrees that every situation is different and therefore flexibility is needed.

Jim Lespasio, 8 Patriot Circle, asked what the benefits to the town are by amending the existing greenbelt provision.

Ms. Perry shared the following comments: 1) the biggest issue is the 50' no-build rule around cluster developments (impedes some homeowners from installing accessory structures, such as a garden shed); 2) there are problems with smaller lots (a wide planting requirement is disproportionate and is deterring developers or property owners from moving forward); 3) in general, the existing greenbelt provision is restrictive, rigid and excessive and should be more flexible to allow review on a case-by-case basis.

Director Garber pointed out that on smaller size commercial and industrial lots, the greenbelt can have a huge impact on a business' economic development.

Mr. Lespasio spoke about existing setback requirements in residential cluster development; and then shared that he was concerned about buffers being cut back too far and reducing protection for existing neighborhoods.

Amy Lloyd spoke about the benefits of cluster development (under the proposed zoning amendment) versus a conventional subdivision.

Mr. Lespasio asked if there has been any successful cluster subdivision in town.

Mr. Cohen gave Freedom Estates Cluster Subdivision development as an example, and said that parts of a cluster subdivision may be successful, while other areas in the development are not. He and reiterated that this is the reason why having a dimensional standard (one-size fits all approach) doesn't work.

Ms. Perry reiterated that the *key benefit* of encouraging cluster development is that a developer is required to dedicate 25% of its parcel for open space for conservation or recreation.

Ms. Lloyd commented that the problem with current cluster development rules is that they don't encourage a developer to take into consideration topography and land features, so there may be clear-cutting of the property and replanting of pine trees that most likely will not survive over time. Ms. Lloyd pointed out that currently the Planning Board doesn't have the amount of discretionary power to review a site for its specific needs as it would under the proposed amendment if passed.

Chair Hanegan mentioned that the proposed amendment doesn't only take away the 50' provision restriction; it has a lot of text in the revised language to guide the decision making of the Board with well thought out ideas that makes more sense and is in the best interest of the town.

Mr. Lespasio, (as an example and referring to Freedom Estates Cluster development constraints), said he was still wondering why a resident can't install a shed in their backyard and the town still maintain a dimensional standard for buffers.

Director Garber explained that part of the reason for varying from a set dimensional buffer is to promote more appealing buffers. Mr. Garber further explained that the amended discretionary provision would allow cluster and planned residential development to make better use of its natural resources without causing hardship.

Mr. Lespasio asked if Planning staff knew how many existing parcels in town could potentially qualify as a cluster developer and could be impacted by the passing of the proposed zoning amendment.

Ms. Mustapich said this is a complicated question because property owners could potentially combine parcels and come forward to create a cluster development.

Ms. Perry said you have to have a certain size tract of land to create a cluster.

Mr. Lespasio re-worded his question and asked; how many parcels of land in town would this proposed zoning amendment affect if parcels were not combined.

Director Garber replied that although the town is largely built out, there are some remaining unbuilt parcels but he did not have the exact number to hand. He believes that overall, there is plenty of potential for future cluster and planned residential development in town.

Mr. Lespasio asked when final amendments need to be made to this zoning proposal before it's submitted to the Selectmen for the Warrant for Fall Town Meeting.

Ms. Perry said that another opportunity to submit comments on the proposed zoning amendment would be on September 23, during the Public Hearing. Ms. Perry also noted that amendments to zoning articles can also be made on Town Meeting floor.

Andrew Jeffrey, 11 Patriot Circle, shared that cluster development bylaw was approved in 1973 and PRD in 1979; and then asked if the greenbelt provision was part of cluster development during that approval time. Director Garber said he believes it was.

Mr. Jeffrey asked if something had changed in Bedford that promoted the need to pass a cluster development bylaw. Director Garber said that in the late 60's and early 70's, many communities passed a cluster development provision as a result of a pioneer planner in Carlisle who was seeking an alternative development style.

Ms. Perry added that she conjectured that the greenbelt provision started with industrial/commercial property first and later was used for residential developments, but that would need to be verified.

Mr. Jeffrey commented that the existing 50' no build provision seems to protect natural resources and provide a pathway for animals; and said if it were removed, is there still a way to preserve these resources.

Mr. Garber said yes, by what is being proposed now. Mr. Garber pointed out that providing dense rows of trees and adding a fence is actually contrary to the idea of trying to preserve a pathway for animals and natural resources.

Mr. Jeffrey said; if requiring a fence is the issue or the density of the trees then why not remove the fence requirement from the bylaw and reduce the density of the trees instead of taking away the dimensional standard.

Mr. Garber responded that the 50' perimeter swath of land requirement is part of what makes this existing bylaw *not* work.

Ms. Perry spoke about the overlapping constraints within the existing bylaw requiring a developer/property owner to provide 25% of its site for common/open space land over and above the requirement for a 50' perimeter no-build strip.

Amy Lloyd (referring to cluster and planned residential development) pointed out that even if fences were not required and the density of the trees were reduced, a developer could still plant rows (even if fewer) of pine trees and then asked; how does that protect the existing natural resources.

Chair Hanegan said the goals in the proposed zoning amendment are the same as in the current provision; however the proposed zoning amendment provides more discretion to create better development.

Mr. Jeffrey asked if there will be other opportunities to share additional changes to the proposed zoning amendment.

Ms. Mustapich replied that a public hearing will be held on September 23, and that would be a good time to share further comments. Ms. Mustapich also informed Mr. Jeffrey that he could move forward with a petitioner's article if he was not in favor of what's being proposed.

Mr. Cohen asked residents to forward any additional comments they may have to Planning staff, and said that staff would be sure to provide the Board with those comments.

Dan Sabbag, 7 Patriot Circle, expressed concerns and opposition to the proposed changes to the greenbelt bylaw. Mr. Sabbag commented that the changes appear to favor developers and not to protect abutters in residential areas. Mr. Sabbag asked if under the *proposed* greenbelt provision, can developers cut down existing trees, replant and then be able to build within the 50' perimeter.

A board member replied that under the *existing* greenbelt provision a developer can potentially clear-cut a site, plant pine trees, and install a 6' fence (It was also noted that under special permit process it's possible for the Board to request that the developer preserve existing trees where possible). Under the proposed zoning amendment, the Board would have broader flexibility to require a developer to protect existing trees where possible and request specific measures to preserve existing natural resources.

Mr. Cohen commented that he is in favor of the proposed amendment because of its flexibility; and then asked who decides which existing trees shall remain on a site.

Ms. Perry said the developer needs to identify on the plan all existing trees and show which trees they plan to save and/or remove, as well as show what replacement trees and vegetation they plan to provide.

Mr. Cohen asked if the developer has to mark the status of trees saved/removed on site.

Mr. Garber and Ms. Perry both replied yes, and mentioned that a cut to line would need to be established and shown on the plans.

Frederick Harrington, 9 Patriot Circle, voiced that the proposed zoning bylaw amendment would affect residents' existing homes; and that this change is not good for current homeowners.

Chair Hanegan asked Mr. Harrington to further explain how this change would not be good for current homeowners.

Mr. Harrington commented that his understanding is that the 50' greenbelt dimensional standard is being removed from the current zoning bylaw with the notion that the Board will have more discretionary powers during development reviews. Mr. Harrington commented that discretionary powers for the Board doesn't mean this is good for homeowners, and then further discussed the potential for buffers between residential developments to be reduced to whatever the Board sees fits versus what homeowners would like under the proposed amendment.

Mr. Cohen informed Mr. Harrington that the Board has more discretion when reviewing cluster subdivisions versus conventional subdivisions even with the existing greenbelt provision. Mr. Cohen said he understands that the concern of some residents pertains to not setting a defined dimension/ for a buffer under the proposed zoning amendment. Mr. Cohen mentioned that he was uncertain at this time whether defining a dimensional number is necessary. Mr. Cohen also mentioned Mr. Lespasio's idea to allow (in certain instances) building accessory structures in the no build buffer is something to consider.

Ms. Lloyd reiterated that existing setbacks standards will remain the same so there is no issue of building closer to existing residential neighborhoods than what is required. Ms. Lloyd commented that the question in hand is; should there be a set dimensional buffer standard or should the Board be able to have a say on specific site features.

Chair Hanegan asked if Planning staff could provide some illustrative examples of problematic development situations when employing the current greenbelt provision for the Board and others to review during the September 23 Zoning Amendment Public Hearing.

A further, but brief exchange of information took place regarding the inflexibility of the 50' no build rule; however, because the Board needed to move forward with other scheduled agenda items, the public was informed that there will be further opportunity for discussion during the scheduled Zoning Amendment Public Hearing for Landscaping, Tree Protection and Visual Screening in developments, including Greenbelts, and perimeter no building rules in Cluster and Planned Residential Developments, on September 23.

2) Zoning Amendment Public Hearing—Industrial Mixed Use draft proposal

Industrial Mixed Use Zoning Amendment Public Hearing began at 8:47 PM

Amy Lloyd, Planning Board Clerk, read for the record a public notice stating that the Planning Board is considering an amendment to Section 15 of the Zoning Bylaw to replace the Industrial Mixed Use provisions with modernized uses and development alternatives.

Planning Director Garber explained that the proposed Industrial Mixed Use (IMU) special permit bylaw replaces the entire existing Section 15 in the Zoning Bylaws. The amended IMU bylaw eliminates the residential mixed use option and creates a more modernize bylaw that will encourage economic development by providing a broader list of allowed economic uses; including hotels, restaurants, and some retail. Mr. Garber mentioned that the amended IMU bylaw would encourage start-up and growing businesses, and can be applied in various districts thus invigorating those zones.

Amy Lloyd shared concerns regarding businesses with drive-thrus. Ms. Lloyd commented that Bedford residents are looking forward to curtailing the number of fast food/take out restaurants.

Lisa Mustapich shared that drive-thrus are desirable for those who are less mobile.

Jeffrey Cohen inquired if the Maximum FAR (Floor Area Ratio) of .35 for IMU development would be favorable.

Director Garber spoke about FAR being increased to .40 in cases where a shared parking plan has been submitted and demonstrate that the overall parking would be reduced to less than what's required in section 7.4 of the zoning bylaw.

Anne Cooper-Kiessling, 53 Concord Road, asked what the purpose of removing the residential component from the IMU bylaw was.

Director Garber shared that the decision to remove the residential component was based on receiving feedback from people over the past couple of years.

Ms. Cooper-Kiessling asked if residential would be eliminated altogether.

Director Garber replied no; and then gave the Middlesex Turnpike area as an example where residential is already included in the mix.

Ms. Cooper-Kiessling inquired about the landscape numbers and how they were derived.

Mr. Garber shared that the landscape numbers were adjusted to align with other communities.

Steve Hagan, 2 Williams Street, commented that he was concerned about flood plain issues and how that can impede development. Mr. Hagan also spoke about having height restrictions in certain areas.

Director Garber said explained that the flood plain issue has to do with FEMA and the recent changes that were made to the Flood Plain maps.

Catherine Perry mentioned that Planning works very closely with Conservation on these matters.

Attorney Pamela Brown asked how the numbers in section 15.4.2 --Minimum Mixed Use Floor Area Ratio (FAR) were derived. Director Garber explained that typical floor scenarios for actual retail, office and industrial uses were tested and these percentages came from that exercise. Ms. Brown also suggested that the numbers for the minimum floor area-per-use be expressed inversely as the larger number so that they would be clearer.

Attorney Brown asked; what about the “unknown”; when a developer comes forward but they don’t know who the tenants are.

Staff responded that calculations are based on categories of use allowed.

Julie Turner, 431 Concord Road, also referring to section 15.4.2 asked what if multiple artists’ studios wanted to locate in particular area; can this be done? Staff responded that there can be multiple businesses in a property.

Catherine Perry spoke about the Board’s previous preference that any increase in density be through expanding upward rather than outward and said she wondered if by increasing Lot Coverage more than FAR it may encourage single story development.

Director Garber said that the intent is to correct the 25% coverage.

Ms. Brown commented that in Section 15.7.2 Dimensional minima and maxima for the full development parcel, the height is the only dimension that wasn’t flexible.

Director Garber confirmed that this is deliberate, as height needs careful consideration.

Amy Lloyd commented that she is not in favor of changing numbers on the spot because these numbers were tested.

Jeffrey Cohen said the Board can always review height later, but for now, he is in favor of the draft proposal for IMU that was presented this evening with the exception of amending the following language in Section 15.4.1 -- No single use or like grouping of uses shall occupy ~~less~~ **more** than ~~8%~~ **92%** of the gross floor area of a single building or ~~6%~~ **more than 94%** of the total GFA off all buildings on site.

*MOTION: Jeffrey Cohen moved to close the IMU Zoning Amendment Public Hearing.
(Lisa Mustapich seconded the motion)*

VOTE: 4-0-0

TIME: 9:11 PM

*MOTION: Jeffrey Cohen moved to approve the draft proposal for a Zoning Amendment to replace existing Section 15 Industrial Mixed Use Provisions with new language presented this evening with the exception of amending the following language in Section 15.4.1 -- No single use or like grouping of uses shall occupy ~~less~~ **more** than ~~8%~~ **92%** of the gross floor area of a single building or ~~6%~~ **more than 94%** of the total GFA off all buildings on site.*

(Lisa Mustapich seconded the motion)

VOTE: 4-0-0

DEVELOPMENT UPDATES: (brief verbal updates provided by Catherine Perry, Assistant Planner)

- Bikeway Café—developer has not submitted a formal application to date.
- 57 & 75 Hartwell Road and 16 Beacon Street— (potential cluster subdivision); developer has not submitted any new information or a formal application since its Preliminary Subdivision Review on July 22, 2014.
- Instrumentation Laboratory— potential site plan review; applicant hasn't submitted a formal site plan application to date.
- Irene Road— Cluster Development Special Permit with Definitive Subdivision Plan Public Hearing will be continued on October 1, 2014.
- Bedford Marketplace—representatives plan to meet with Planning staff to review some upcoming small modifications to previously approved site plan.
- Bedford Business Park—submission of a potential ANR (Approval Not Required) Form A application and plan. The property owners of the Bedford Business Park intend to acquire some land from MADOT. The intent is to submit an ANR Plan to create a new lot bound by the existing property line of Crosby Road to the north, thus creating a new lot line bound by the Route 3 north on-ramp to the east, south and west.
- Depot Park Building— inquiry regarding a potential to include a personal service use at this site.

BUSINESS SESSION: (Continued)

3) Minutes—July 22, 2014 Regular Session

MOTION: Lisa Mustapich moved to approve the July 22, 2014 Regular Session Minutes as submitted. (Jeffrey Cohen seconded the motion)

VOTE: 3-0-1 (Amy Lloyd abstained; she was not present during the July 22, 2014 meeting)

3a) Minutes—August 12, 2014 Regular Session

MOTION: Lisa Mustapich moved to approve August 12, 2014 Regular Session and Irene Road Cluster Development Special Permit with Definitive Subdivision Plan Public Hearing Minutes with minor amendments. (Jeffrey Cohen seconded the motion)

VOTE: 4-0-0

ADJOURNMENT:

*MOTION: Lisa Mustapich moved to adjourn the meeting.
(Amy Lloyd seconded the motion)*

VOTE: 4-0-0

TIME: 9:45PM