

BEDFORD PLANNING BOARD
Selectmen's Meeting Room – Town Hall
Regular Session Minutes
July 22, 2014

MEMBERS PRESENT: Shawn Hanegan, Chair;

Jeffrey Cohen, Sandra Hackman, and Lisa Mustapich (left meeting at 9:41pm)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Amy Lloyd, Clerk

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 Jeffrey Cohen

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

DEVELOPMENT SESSION

1) 2 Irene Road Preliminary Subdivision Review

Chair Hanegan reviewed for the record documentation submitted in conjunction with preliminary subdivision review for 2-Irene Road as follows;

- Public Notice dated July 10, 2014—courtesy public meeting notice informing abutters of preliminary subdivision review for 2 Irene Road on July 22, 2014.
- Letter dated June 23, 2014 from Attorney Brown, on behalf of Dudley Developers LLC/Paul Marcus, stating that the developer proposes to re-develop property at 55 Pine Hill Road (also known as Irene Road); and that the proposed subdivision will have a total of 5 lots. (Marion & Ray Bryan- existing lot, plus four (4) new house lots).
- Attached to above reference letter: **1)** dimensional compliance chart comparison; **2)** Form B Application for Approval of Preliminary Plan; **3)** Special Permit application dated June 23, 2014; **4)** G.I.S. locus area map for 2 Irene Road; **5)** Plan of Land of Irene Road Subdivision dated February 22, 1952; **6)** Preliminary Subdivision Plan (P-1) dated 6/24/14 and revised on 6/25/14-open space.
- Memo dated July 17, 2014 from Planning Director Garber, sharing information regarding; legal overview, project summary, road design, comments received from town staff, site layout issues, and issues pursuant to the definitive plan.
- Email dated July 17, 2014 from Kristin Dowdy DPW Civil Engineer—indicating that DPW has decided to refrain from providing comments until Definitive Subdivision plans are filed for this project.
- Email dated July 17, 2014 from Christopher Laskey, Code Enforcement Director; stating he has no comments at this time.

- Email dated July 17, 2014 from Marc Saucier, Traffic Enforcement Officer; offering that the police department doesn't have any issues with the preliminary proposal.
- Email dated July 17, 2014 from Elizabeth Bagdonas, Conservation Administrator, indicating that the proposed subdivision includes the reservation of a significant amount of open space/common land.
- Email dated July 15, 2014 from Heidi Porter, Board of Health Director, noting that the Board of Health doesn't have any comments or concerns at this time; however, they look forward to reviewing a more detailed Definitive Subdivision Plan.

Chair Hanegan informed the public that a preliminary subdivision plan review is meant for the Board to offer the developer/applicant verbal feedback and for staff to provide written guidance regarding the general layout of lots and proposed access. Chair Hanegan pointed out that preliminary subdivision review doesn't require a public hearing, advertising or direct abutter notice; however, *as a courtesy*, a public notice was sent to abutters who might be interested in attending this evening's meeting to hear more about the proposed development. Chair Hanegan also informed everyone that a more detail review of the site will take place when a Definitive Subdivision Plan, along with a Special Permit application for a Cluster Subdivision is filed, and is followed-up with a required public hearing with public notice, advertising, and abutter notices.

Attorney Brown, representing Paul Marcus dba Dudley Development and Ray & Marion Bryan, property owner explained that her client is proposing a five (5) lot subdivision consisting of; one (1) lot for Ray and Marion Bryan's existing home, and four (4) new house lots. Ms. Brown further explained that the Bryan's 7.8 acre parcel was divided in 1952 into 17 lots (Lots 1-5 were built with Pine Hill Road frontage); and the only construction on substandard Irene Road was the Bryan's current residence. Ms. Brown also shared that approximately seven years ago, a subdivision proposal was brought before the town, but wasn't found favorable because it didn't satisfy the full requirements of the current zoning bylaw. Ms. Brown discussed a new cluster subdivision design that would better fulfill the intent of the zoning bylaws as follows; **1)** dedicate approx. 40% of the proposed property to common open space land-- this preserved land is intended to be donated to the town; **2)** construct a 500' roadway with a 22' width (24' width is standard)-- applicant trying to preserve green space; **3)** provide a 5-foot wide sidewalk and possibly a single streetlight; **4)** provide a y-shaped hammerhead turnaround as opposed to constructing a full cul-de-sac—attention being given to preserve mature trees, maximize open space, protect wetland resources, and future house lot sizes; and **5)** potential to include a pedestrian trail link from Irene Road through the open space and town land to the rail trail.

Comments:

- **Lisa Mustapich** and **Sandra Hackman** were in favor of the road width being less than the required 24'; however, Ms. Hackman articulated that even a 22' width might be unnecessarily wide for this site because impervious surface should be minimized whenever possible.
- **Shawn Hanegan** questioned the applicant as to whether or not they could move the house on Lot #2 to be sited outside of the 50' greenbelt and the applicant said that this can be accomplished.

- **Sandra Hackman** asked about stormwater management and suggested that the applicant consider low impact development.
- **Jeffrey Cohen** asked if the improved Irene Road would seek status as a public way, and the applicant confirmed that this was the case. Mr. Cohen also inquired about sight distance at the Pine Hill intersection with Irene Road and the possibility of including a crosswalk. Mr. Marcus said he has sight distance data to share with DPW, but has not had the opportunity to discuss it with Public Works Engineer, Adrienne St. John, because she's away on vacation. Mr. Marcus commented that he is willing to work with DPW on the outcome of the sight distance study. Regarding the crosswalk suggestion, Mr. Marcus indicated that upon speaking to Adrienne St. John, the general policy of the DPW is not to encourage an excessive number of crosswalks throughout town due to public safety concerns and traffic flow impacts.
- **Several Board members** mentioned the possibility of a connecting trail segment through the common open space to reach the York Conservation Area and eventually the Narrow Gauge Trail and Ms. Hackman asked if the sidewalk could be extended to fulfill this purpose, but she also acknowledged that this would create more impervious surface.
- **Ms. Lois Thoms**, resident at 49 Pine Hill Road, shared concerned regarding flooding on her property and also asked if the sidewalk from Irene Road would extend to Pine Hill Road. Mr. Marcus first commented that some stormwater management solution will be constructed to avoid excess runoff onto the Thoms property; but also voiced that there may not be a connection to a storm drain or catch basin. Secondly Mr. Marcus confirmed that there will be a sidewalk connection extended to Pine Hill Road.

Summary of Guidance (written guidance will later be provided to the applicant):

- 1) Move house on Lot #2 to avoid issues with 50' wide greenbelt requirement in Section 8.2.8.
- 2) Check with Fire Chief on road width and overall design for access by fire apparatus.
- 3) Provide design details regarding sidewalk, including street trees/green strips along the roadway and sidewalk, and specifications regarding width, curbing material, hydrants, materials, lighting and any other pertinent specifications.
- 4) Submit full stormwater design with runoff calculations, and the way in which the design is apportioned among closed, low impact and natural drainage approaches, as any are proposed for the site. (Advance consultation with DPW Engineering is recommended)
- 5) Design for construction as a site improvement a connecting trail segment through the common open space that aligns logically with access to the Murray Otis York Conservation area and potentially, in the future, to the Narrow Gauge Trail.
- 6) Provide assurances that plans to deed proposed open space to the town are acceptable to Conservation Commission.
- 7) Delineate on a plan intentions regarding retention of larger, mature trees and designation of tree-cutting limitation lines. Determine if there are any Scenic Roads bylaw issues where the upgraded Irene Road will meet Pine Hill Road.

Applicant announced that they plan to file a Special Permit application for a cluster development with a definitive subdivision plan in time to be heard at the August 12 meeting.

2) 57 & 75 Hartwell Road and 16 Beacon Street Preliminary Cluster Subdivision Review

Chair Hanegan reviewed for the record documentation submitted in conjunction with the preliminary subdivision review for 57 & 75 Hartwell Road and 16 Beacon Street as follows:

- Public Notice dated July 10, 2014—courtesy public meeting notice informing abutters of preliminary subdivision review for 57 & 75 Hartwell Road and 16 Beacon Street on July 22, 2014.
- Letter dated June 24, 2014 from Attorney Brown, on behalf of Bonus Varghese, property owner, stating that they are proposing a re-division of the property into a (5) lot cluster subdivision, which will include a new roadway and a lot for the existing home at 57 Hartwell Road.
- Attached to Ms. Brown's July 10, 2014 letter—**1)** Zoning Summary Chart; **2)** Form B application for Preliminary Subdivision Plan dated June 24, 2014; **3)** Special Permit Application Form dated June 23, 2014 (Cluster Subdivision); **4)** Preliminary Plan (C-1) Proposed Residential Subdivision (57 & 75 Hartwell Road and 16 Beacon St.); **5)** Topography G.I.S. Map dated 6/25/14 highlighting proposed property; and **6)** Hartwell-Washington Neighborhood G.I.S. Map dated 6/25/14.
- Memo dated July 18, 2014 from Catherine Perry, Assistant Planner, offering information and comments regarding 57 & 75 Hartwell Road and 16 Beacon Street Preliminary Cluster Subdivision plan application for review. (Attached were photos-- South portion of Beacon Street—site on left; street stub; 57 and 75 Hartwell Road frontage; 11 and 9 Patriot Circle; a portion of 9 and 7 Patriot Circle, and portion of 7 and 5 Patriot Circle)
- Email dated July 17, 2014 from Kristin Dowdy, DPW Civil/Environmental Engineer, commenting that DPW would rather hold off providing comments until the Definitive Subdivision Plans are filed for this project and also noting one minor observation as follows: there is an existing tree within the public right-of-way (at 75 Hartwell Road) that will require a tree hearing prior to removal for construction of the new roadway.
- Email dated July 17, 2014, from Christopher Laskey, Code Enforcement Engineer, indicating that he has no comments on the preliminary subdivision application for this proposed project.
- Email dated July 17, 2014, from Marc Saucier, Traffic Officer, stating that the Police Department doesn't have any issues with the proposed preliminary subdivision for 57 and 75 Hartwell Road and 16 Beacon St.
- Email dated July 17, 2014 from Elizabeth Bagdonas, Conservation Administrator, indicating that the proposed lots 4 and 5 will require Conservation Commission review; and that the Notices of Intent will require a field delineated wetland boundary to be confirmed by the Commission. Ms. Bagdonas also suggested that the preliminary plans should show that the building envelopes will be sufficient for the planned residential structures--both initial single-family houses and any other anticipated structures such as decks and sheds.

- Email dated July 10, 2014 from Pam Brown; providing a response to Catherine Perry, Assistant Planner, regarding the total amount of wetlands on site (based on previous delineation and Town's GIS info.)
- Email dated July 15, 2014 from Heidi Porter, Board of Health Director, commenting that the Board of Health does not have any concerns with the Preliminary Subdivision application; and further commenting that she looks forward to reviewing the more detailed Definitive Subdivision plans when filed.
- Letter (with attached photos) dated July 15, 2014 to Cathy Silvestrone, Planning A.A., from resident John Stella, 20 Washington Street. Mr. Stella sharing his strong opposition to building 5 homes on a heavily wooded area and wetlands in the vicinity of his backyard (and others) living on Washington St.

Attorney Brown conveyed that applicants Bonus Varghese and Renna Thopurathu are proposing a 5-lot cluster subdivision on their 4.14 acre site. The subdivision will include (3) three house lots along the east side of a *newly* proposed 40' right-of-way (terminating in a cul-de-sac, with a 22' paved road width and a sidewalk on one side of the new street) and (2) two somewhat larger house lots positioned at the end of the cul-de-sac. Ms. Brown reviewed the lot layout as follows; **lot 1** will consist of the applicants' existing house at 57 Harwell Road, **lots 2 and 3** will have back yards abutting homes on Beacon Street, **lot 4** is situated near proposed open space (at the Washington Street end of the property and near 16 Beacon Street), and **lot 5** will be located adjacent to Patriot Circle.

Ms. Brown also highlighted the following as improvements to the site (if applicant moves forward with a cluster subdivision rather than a conventional):

- Road width standard is 24'; however applicant is willing to reduce that width to 22' (depending on Fire Department approval) to minimize impervious surface.
- Noted that the site is situated in Residence C; therefore the minimum lot area is 25,000 sf for a conventional subdivision; however, under cluster subdivision provisions the minimum lot area is 15,000 sf, thus giving opportunity to provide common open space and preserve a good amount of land.
- Noted that the existing house lots in the neighborhood are in the 15,000-20,000 sf. range, so proposed house lots sizes would remain within the character of the existing neighborhood.
- The proposed configuration would allow for pedestrian access to local trails, conservation areas, and the Middle School.

Before taking comments, Chair Hanegan reiterated the purpose of a preliminary subdivision review for residents and others that joined the meeting for 57 & 75 Hartwell Road and 16 Beacon Street Preliminary Subdivision discussion. Chair Hanegan explained that the Board's role is to provide feedback/guidance to the applicant, and that no vote will take place this evening in conjunction with this preliminary review. (**Note: refer to page 2 of these minutes for Chair Hanegan's detailed explanation of the Preliminary Subdivision Review process**)

Comments:

Catherine Perry, Assistant Planner, commented that the applicant's zoning compliance table omits the 50 foot 'no build' rule that applies around the perimeter of a cluster development under the greenbelt provision in the zoning bylaw (Section 8.2.8). When combined with the wetlands setbacks and the normal front, side and rear yard setbacks, this creates problems for some of the lots as they will have impractically small building envelopes. Also it raises an issue for the proposed change to the lot boundaries for the existing house at 57 Hartwell Road (where both the existing lot and the house position are non-conforming), because a new non-conformity will be introduced.

Attorney Brown asked for clarification of the last point. Ms. Perry stated that her interpretation of the law (in MGL Ch 40A Sec 6 and the Bedford Zoning Bylaw) that applies to this situation, taking account of recent advice from town counsel on the subject, is that the non-conforming lot cannot be reconfigured to result in a lot that has new non-conformities.

Sandra Hackman voiced that she is in favor of reducing the roadway, deeding open space land to the town, and providing pedestrian access to nearby trails. Ms. Hackman also asked if the proposed houses would be constructed with energy saving features.

Maria Bard, 5 Patriot Circle, commented about two new homes recently built (off of Hartwell Road), on Athena Lane as being very large, and then further commented that she doubts the proposed houses in this current proposal/project would be consistent in size with the existing neighborhood.

Attorney Brown stated that she would provide building size footprints at a further review.

Sandra Hackman asked Ms. Bard what her concerns are regarding house size.

Ms. Bard shared that she is concerned that there will not be a sufficient buffer between the proposed development and Patriot Circle.

Theodore Bard, 5 Patriot Circle, echoed the same concern and added that the proposed common areas appear to be wetlands and that these wetlands will remain as wetlands.

Ms. Hackman expressed that she would like the proposed houses to fit in the spirit of the surrounding neighborhood.

Lisa Mustapich stated she prefers reducing the roadway width and including a T-turnaround if possible, shared concerns regarding proposed green space (islands) within cul-de-sacs because of maintenance issues, and further stated that issues with the 50' buffer provision need to be addressed.

Jeffrey Cohen said he is interested in reviewing the stormwater plan and mentioned that he was curious if a buffer should be required for Patriot Circle abutters. Mr. Cohen also asked if it's okay for a road to go up to a lot line. Ms. Perry replied that she couldn't see any rule preventing

it. However, the greenbelt provision calls for planting in the 50 foot perimeter strip, with some flexibility as to exactly what is required.

Daniel Sabbag, 7 Patriot Circle, voiced concern regarding the proposed roadway abutting his property and potential problems relating to his fencing, snow, and drainage. Mr. Sabbag stated he would like buffers to be considered.

Jeffrey Cohen agrees that buffers/greenbelt should be respected and also commented that he is in favor of reducing road width.

Andrew Jeffrey, 11 Patriot Circle, shared the following points; **1)** the scope/density of the proposed project doesn't match the area; **2)** a greenbelt should be incorporated in the plans; **3)** spoke about existing wetlands and noted that there are high groundwater issues—concerned with run-off and potential flooding in the Washington Street/Patriot Circle area; and **4)** pointed out that the proposed site is currently wooded; therefore he is worried about clear-cutting the lot, thus impacting the existing buffer.

Jim Lespasio, 8 Patriot Circle, inquired if a 50' buffer/greenbelt in a cluster development has to be located adjacent to the proposed development. Mr. Lespasio also asked for clarification regarding the difference between common land and open space. It was clarified that the terms common land and open space are being used to mean the same thing.

Catherine Perry explained that the cluster bylaw requires an area to be set aside to protect natural features and for use by at least the residents of the development. This is the common land. The greenbelt is a buffering provision between the development and other residential areas and so applies around the edge of the whole property or the developed area of it. The Board needs to determine if the layout of the lots is satisfactory, and if the cluster development meets the intention of the bylaw and provides a sufficient public benefit.

Several residents-- Phillip Friden, 32 Washington Street, Michael Harrington, 9 Patriot Circle, Daniel Archibald, 11 Beacon Street, John & Kristin Zbikowski 13 Beacon Street, Mary Malo 18 Washington Street, and John Stella 20 Washington Street, voiced similar concerns relating to wetlands, potential flooding, and greenbelt/buffer issues.

Attorney Brown stated that the Carluccio residents, 16 Washington Street, shared concern regarding the potential of the proposed development to involve extending Beacon Street [which is currently broken into two dead end streets]. Ms. Brown confirmed that the applicant has no plan for that to happen.

Sandra Hackman urged the applicant to address stormwater/drainage concerns when developing a definitive plan, in consultation with DPW. Ms. Hackman also suggested that the applicant provide an alternative preliminary plan comparing a conventional subdivision to a cluster, and display the building envelopes to ensure that they are sufficient for the residential structures (single-family houses and any other anticipates structures, such as decks and sheds), having regard to wetland and buffer boundaries.

Board members agreed with Ms. Hackman’s suggestions.

BUSINESS SESSION

1) Coast Guard Housing Resolution and Report

An Executive Summary of the Pine Hill Road Charrette, Town of Bedford, MA by DSK/Dewing-Schmid-Kearns, dated June 30, 2014, along with a Resolution (drafted and endorsed by the Selectmen) was submitted to the Board for review and consideration.

Jessica Porter, Assistant Town Manager reported that the Selectmen unanimously voted and signed a Resolution during its July 21, 2014 meeting regarding the potential use of the Coast Guard Housing property (located off of Pine Hill Road), and that the Selectmen are seeking consideration and potential endorsement of this Resolution by the Planning Board.

Ms. Porter shared the following summary in relation to the Resolution provided—

The Town, through the Bedford Municipal Affordable Housing trust, plans to negotiate a sale price for the property with the Coast Guard. Once negotiated, the town will seek a 90 day option period to buy the property. During the option period, the town will issue an RFP to find a developer who will commit to building the vision (**Option A: Infill of Existing Residential Fabric or Option B: Cottage Clusters from the Charette**). The town will then purchase the property and immediately sell it to the *chosen* developer. The developer could then propose a zoning change. A zoning change would allow the town to impose income limits up to 100% AMI (Average Median Income) on the affordable units, and the town could choose as few or as many units they want. Ms. Porter noted that this approach allows the use of community preservation funds. Another approach Ms. Porter shared is that the developer could propose a 40B development. This would require 25% of the units to be affordable AND the town could only go up to 80% AMI (Average Median Income) on the affordable units. Ms. Porter noted that this approach would include utilizing funds from the Housing Trust.

Board Member Comments/Concerns:

Jeffrey Cohen asked Ms. Porter to explain the advantages/disadvantages of renovating the existing units versus rebuilding new.

Ms. Porter explained that it’s actually more expensive to renovate the existing houses and try to integrate them with new structures than to demolish existing structures and redevelop the site.

Jeffrey Cohen asked what the time frame is. Ms. Porter replied: Special Fall Town Meeting if a zoning change is needed.

Chair Hanegan, in relation to signing the Resolution before the Board, shared his concern regarding what happens if a developer was unable to move forward with options provided, and then asked if the Resolution documentation is open-ended.

Planning Board members articulated that they would like to have opportunity to review the RFP in case they would like to offer input.

Lisa Mustapich wanted to make it known that signing the Resolution is not a *formal* Planning Board vote on a development; however, in concept, the Board agrees with the direction the Selectmen outlined in the Resolution.

Sandra Hackman asked who will decide whether the proposed development will be a LIP (Local Initiative Project) or a 40B Comprehensive Permit Project.

Ms. Hackman voiced that she would like to see architectural drawings to get an idea what the units will look like. Planning Director Garber said the Board could ask for a design review to be included in the RFP.

Planning Board members shared some concerns regarding density and the potential number of school aged children, depending on which option is chosen.

Planning Director Garber, referring to density concerns, commented that the design of the structures/buildings will make the difference on the outcome.

Ms. Porter said that ideally the town would like to include master bedroom suites on the first floor to accommodate seniors seeking to downsize.

Planning Director Garber spoke about the possibility of hiring a consultant to assist with zoning changes (if needed), and mentioned he would be willing to get costs.

.

MOTION: Jeffrey Cohen moved that the Board sign the Coast Guard Housing property Resolution drafted and signed by the Selectmen on July 21, 2014. (Sandra Hackman seconded the motion). Board members discussed and agreed that the motion should reflect the above concerns by including a copy of the approved minutes with the signed Resolution.

VOTE: 4-0-0

2) **New Industrial Mixed Use Bylaw Concept Discussion**—

Planning Director Garber introduced a draft that he has prepared of a re-written Section 15 (Industrial Mixed Use) of the Zoning Bylaws for discussion and feedback. Director Garber shared that the list of new uses, found on page 3, is “preliminary” and that he is researching other communities for up-to-date land uses in the process of creating more modern industrial use classifications. Mr. Garber said permitted uses can be put in tiers, listing them in order of what the town wants. Ms. Perry suggested putting new specific uses within older broad categories to provide clarity to applicants while keeping continuity in the bylaw. Mr. Garber also said that it’s important for developers to understand that the Plan Review Criteria for Industrial Mixed Use Projects (Section 15.3.1) is what the town wants. Director Garber briefly reviewed a few more sections in the draft IMU and then asked Board members to share their thoughts.

Overall Board members were enthusiastic and pleased with the draft IMU bylaw.

Note; Lisa Mustapich left the meeting shortly after Board members shared their comments.

Comments:

Sandra Hackman articulated that she was especially impressed with the parking provisions, and shared the following suggestions: **1)** include “amenities” in addition to aesthetics as an improvement to community aesthetics in Section 15.1 General Purpose; **2)** remove the words “wherever possible” from various sentences in section 15.3.2; **3)** in section 15.6 remove the word “felt”; **4)** asked if the percentages of GFL (Gross Floor Area) of a single building appear low in Section 15.4 (Minimum Mixed Use Floor Area)—Director Garber said that he tested these numbers and they seem fit; **5)** asked if in Section 15.8.5 (Reserve Parking), would a developer need to return for approval—Director Garber replied: yes.

Chair Hanegan expressed that he likes the draft language because it conveys more what a developer *can do* instead of what they can’t.

Jeffrey Cohen voiced that he was satisfied with the direction of the draft IMU bylaw; and shared the following suggestions: **1)** specify offsite connectivity that the town may want; **2)** add take-out to restaurant services; **3)** remove charging stations as an accessory use and placing them in the parking section; **4)** firm up the language in traffic mitigation section remove the words “is likely to be” and change to “will be”.

Catherine Perry, Assistant Planner, shared an analysis she has done to identify non-conforming properties in the industrial districts. Since they are numerous, there is a case for keeping the overlay district option as a vehicle for enabling site redevelopment to receive full planning review (with incentives), rather than the more basic tests that apply when these properties go to the ZBA.

Glenn Garber, Planning Director, spoke about potentially adjusting parking regulations and also reported that Alyssa Sandoval, Economic Development Coordinator, is meeting with some businesses in the Middlesex Turnpike area in September; and therefore suggested that this maybe a good time to showcase the newly drafted IMU bylaw and receive feedback.

DEVELOPMENT UPDATE (verbal)

Bedford Market Place—Director Garber reported that the developer is currently doing site work and that the Selectmen are still in the process of discussing traffic-related issues.

BUSINESS SESSION (Continued)

- 3) **Minutes**
 - a) June 24, 2014 Minutes—

MOTION: Jeffrey Cohen moved to approve June 24, 2014 Minutes with minor amendments (Sandra Hackman seconded the motion)
VOTE: 3-0-0

b) July 8, 2014 Minutes—

MOTION: Jeffrey Cohen moved to approve July 8, 2014 with a minor amendment (Sandra Hackman seconded the motion)
VOTE: 3-0-0

4) Other

Catherine Perry shared with the Board a written opinion received from Town Counsel which relates to past issues with property owners obtaining relief from Zoning Board of Appeals to reconfigure preexisting nonconforming lots and trade one set of nonconformities for another. Ms. Perry said it was the opinion of Town Counsel that Massachusetts General Laws and the Bedford Zoning Bylaws do not permit a property owner to reconfigure a nonconforming lot, other than in circumstances stated in Section 6.4 of the Zoning Bylaw, relating to eminent domain.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Jeffrey Cohen moved to adjourn the meeting. (Sandra Hackman seconded the motion)
VOTE: 3-0-0
TIME: 10:38PM