

BEDFORD PLANNING BOARD
Zoom Remote Meeting
Minutes
July 25, 2023

MEMBERS PRESENT: Christopher Gittins, Chair; Todd Crowley, Amy Lloyd, Jacinda Barbehenn and Steven Hagan

STAFF PRESENT: Tony Fields, Planning Director; Catherine Perry, Assistant Planner

OTHERS PRESENT: Lizzy and Matthew Dillon, Pamela Brown, Taylor Dowdy (BSC), Peg and Ted Bernhardt, Barry Ganek (architect), Martin, Bonnie and Paul Klein (34 Fletcher Road), Lee Vorderer (42 Fletcher Road), Bob and Sarah Dorer (2 Otis Street), Eleanor Hartley (75 Loomis Street), Renu Bostwick (23 Hartford Street), Erin Sandler-Rathe (28 Hume Road), Jaqueline Bhalla (19 Fletcher Road), Robert Bass (42 Fletcher Road), Kathy Kerby (37 Fletcher Road), Marc and Kay Hamilton (70C Great Road), Thomas Maxwell (106 South Road), David Goldbaum (32 Elm Street), Dot Bergin (*Bedford Citizen*), Shawn Hanegan (Select Board), Paul Mortenson (Select Board), David_____

Chair Gittins called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm, cited the Remote Meeting Guidelines, stated that the meeting is being recorded and called the Roll of Board Members in attendance.

Chair Gittins summarized the agenda.

DEVELOPMENT SESSION

Public Hearing: 1 Railroad Avenue – Mixed use development special permit

MOTION: Proposed by Member Hagan and seconded by Member Barbehenn, to open the public hearing

VOTE: By Roll Call:

Todd Crowley	Aye
Amy Lloyd	Aye
Steven Hagan	Aye
Jacinda Barbehenn	Aye
Christopher Gittins	Aye

Attorney Pam Brown introduced project engineer Taylor Dowdy and applicants Lizzy and Matt Dillon. She shared her screen to show a plan of the site at the corner of Railroad Avenue and South Road on an aerial photo base. She noted that the mixed-use zoning was created some time ago and this site is ripe for development. Showing a 3-d architectural drawing, she described the proposal as comprising a larger mixed-use building with 18 units of residential use and a smaller

building with commercial use but no specific tenants yet. She stated that the Dillons have spoken with neighbors and the project has support.

Ms. Brown referred to the application letter and displayed photographs of the site's surroundings: the road intersection, landscaped corner with a bus stop, Depot Park and nearby buildings. She noted that there is a public parking lot opposite which is partly on private land.

Taylor Dowdy shared his screen. He described existing conditions on the site, largely a gravel area used for bus parking, noting that wetlands at the rear have been flagged. They have begun a hearing with the Conservation Commission and have responded to technical comments from the DPW but will need final approval.

Mr. Dowdy showed the proposed layout, noting there is parking in the middle between the two buildings with a stormwater retention system under it, which will use an existing overflow pipe under Railroad Avenue. A small park is offered as an amenity on the west end of the site. A wide (8 ft) sidewalk is proposed along Railroad Ave., with retail units fronting it. The street is proposed to be widened, allowing a row of parking. Mr. Dowdy commented that it could have the benefit of helping to slow traffic. The design team met with DPW staff to discuss the relationship to previously planned improvements that had been part of the Bikeway extension project. Mr. Dowdy noted that these proposed elements would work with or without the rest of that project. A further 17 parking spaces are proposed at ground level under the large building, with two floors of apartments above. Proposed landscaping includes trees and shrubs, and a path connection is shown at the northeast corner, to South Road and the bus stop.

The Chair asked if staff had any comments to add. Assistant Planner Perry noted that the development is being proposed under Zoning Bylaw Section 18, the Depot Area Mixed Use Overlay District, which contains criteria. Staff has more detailed comments on parking but could offer those when the discussion addresses that topic.

Board Questions and Comments

Member Lloyd said she sees this location as justifying only one parking space per residential unit, i.e. treating the bus route and bikeway as qualifying as Transportation Demand Management. She added that she thinks the public parking lot across the street should have a sign to deter overnight parking.

Ms. Lloyd suggested more shade trees near the play area, and if possible a permeable strip next to Railroad Avenue to help the proposed street trees to thrive.

Ms. Lloyd asked if there is interior access from the parking under the building to the apartments. Mr. Dowdy confirmed there will be an elevator and stairs.

Ms. Lloyd strongly welcomed the proposal.

Member Barbehenn said it looks like a good plan. Given the location, she also thought one parking space per residential unit could be sufficient.

Ms. Barbehenn asked if the developers envision any outdoor dining and if there would be room for that. Mr. Dowdy said they were not sure, as tenants have not yet been identified, but if they propose it they will seek permits and check ADA compliance. Ms. Brown pointed to a location earmarked for a potential patio on the west side of the smaller building.

Ms. Brown mentioned that indoor bike storage is proposed for residents.

Member Hagan noted receipt of a comment letter from a resident and asked what the applicant proposes for the land near the bus stop (in the wide South Road Right Of Way), and if there will be any building entrances there. Mr. Dowdy responded that there are currently a few trees on the property line, which will have to be removed for construction. They propose some new planting. They could look at additional buffering in the ROW, with the Town's permission. They need to go to BARC for the proposed tree removals and compensatory measures.

Member Crowley asked about the height of the main building and the residential unit sizes. The height was given as 37 ft - to meet the zoning bylaw maximum. The units are a mix of studios at 550 sf, one-beds at 684-777 sf and two-beds at 1040-1084 sf.

Mr. Crowley commented that he thinks it likely that many units will only have one car but some may have two.

Mr. Crowley suggested incorporating a solar roof, especially on the south-facing side.

Member Lloyd stated that the existing trees mentioned are of poor quality, being self-sown. She has no objection to their being cut down and new planting done, especially if it extends onto the ROW land.

Ms. Lloyd asked if no bike racks are proposed for a potential coffee shop. Mr. Dowdy pointed to an earmarked location at the front of the patio.

Chair Gittins said he is glad the applicants are discussing harmonizing their development with future design for Railroad Avenue. He thinks the parking proposed would be adequate.

Mr. Gittins noted that a letter was received from the Reed family of 96 South Road (referred to by Mr. Hagan above), which is generally supportive of the development, with some comments which he outlined.

Mr. Gittins said his overall impression is very positive.

Public Questions and Comments

Martin Klein expressed the view that one parking space for each residential unit will not be enough.

Lee Vorderer asked how many residential units will be accessible and how many accessible parking spaces will be provided. Mr. Dowdy responded that there will be three ADA parking spaces, which is just over the requirement, and there will be some units that are ADA accessible too.

Bob Dorer said he likes the proposal. He noted that the Engelhardt Conservation area is behind the property. He said he believed Ken Larson owns this property. Ms. Brown reported that Mr. Larson sold it.

Mr. Dorer asked if there will be any contribution to solving/reducing drainage problems in the area. Mr. Dowdy responded that they are only adding a small amount of impervious surface, since the gravel is very compacted and largely impervious, but they will be mitigating the runoff from parking and roof areas with infiltration systems.

Mr. Dorer asked if there will be an elevator. Ms. Brown confirmed.

Mr. Dorer asked about the dimensions of the public park. These were given as approximately 30 ft by 60 ft.

Eleanor Hartley welcomed the project and said she was glad her husband had the opportunity to speak with the Dillons. She supported the inclusion of as many shade trees as possible and commented that even though the existing trees on the east property line may be of poor quality, they do provide greenery in the view from South Road, so a landscape plan is important.

Renu Bostwick drew attention to climate change, including a likely increase in flooding. She encouraged infiltration measures and coordination of drainage in the area by the Town.

Ms. Bostwick also commented that many young people don't want cars and that this is a perfect location in which to do without. She considered that one parking space per residential unit should be sufficient.

Ms. Bostwick asked if the developer has thought about the Specialized Energy code and considered measures such as Passive House standards, solar panels and not using fossil fuels. She hoped these ideas could be incorporated in the design.

Mr. Dillon responded that the residential units will be all-electric and he is open to considering solar panels on the roof. Residents will have one parking space under the building and will also be able to share the other spaces with retail users. They aim not to cause a parking overflow problem. The development will use electric heat pumps but not be fully fossil fuel free because gas is needed to market units to some commercial tenants such as restaurants.

Martin Klein said he disagreed with the adequacy of one space per residential unit, as the younger generation often needs to drive cars.

Pam Brown stated that peak parking demand times will differ for residential and retail uses, so there is some potential for sharing; also the applicant doesn't want to create a parking problem. She believes the proposal is a 'happy compromise' that will satisfy all the users.

Member Lloyd commented that older people tend to assume everyone needs and uses cars all the time, whereas she knows younger people who prefer to have just one car or none. Residents will be aware of the level of parking provision when they decide to live here.

Lee Vorderer asked if any of the residential apartments will be marketed as affordable under the official program. The applicant team responded that there will be two affordable units.

Erin Sandler-Rathe asked if the developer will consider EV chargers, and urged their provision in both the garage and the public parking area.

Further Board Questions and Comments

Member Lloyd asked if there were any comments from DPW staff. Ms. Perry responded that DPW staff are still reviewing the project. They have begun their review of the stormwater system and interacted with the applicant team on the street design. Ms. Brown stated that the applicant team responded to an initial set of DPW comments in connection with the Conservation Commission review, and copied the Planning Director.

MOTION: Proposed by Member Lloyd and seconded by Member Hagan, to continue the public hearing to the Board's next scheduled meeting on August 8, 2023.

VOTE: By Roll Call:

Todd Crowley	Aye
Amy Lloyd	Aye
Steven Hagan	Aye
Jacinda Barbehenn	Aye
Christopher Gittins	Aye

Public Hearing (continuation): 60 Great Road – Horizontal Mixed-use Special Permit

Attorney Pam Brown, representing applicant Care Enterprises LLC, recapped the proposal, noting that abutters were not present at the first session of the public hearing. She shared her screen to show a new set of slides including a sketch layout with colored markup, showing the proposed 2-family house in a revised position. The house plan has also been shortened slightly.

Ms. Brown stated that the 16 parking spaces shown, plus two in garages, would be more than sufficient to accommodate the uses. She said she believes there are no bike racks currently and the plan shows one at the back of the office building.

Ms. Brown showed the plan on an aerial photo base, pointed to nearby houses and said that the scale of the proposed house fits in well. Its plan shape has been revised slightly for access into the garages. The side setback has been increased to 10 feet.

Ms. Brown noted that most of the tall trees will need to be removed, and said they will coordinate with the abutter on what new plantings will thrive in that space, to buffer the properties. Ms. Brown said she has spoken with Monica Bau also.

Ms. Brown referred to comments received from DPW engineering staff. The applicant's engineer will respond on storm drainage and utility connections. The two residential units will have separate meters.

Architect Barry Ganek described the proposed house as traditional wood-framed construction with some decorative features. He stated it is not overly large, and described the floor plans. Each unit will have 3 bedrooms, 2 baths, an unfinished basement and a partial third floor space. Ms. Brown drew attention to the broken roofline.

Board Questions

Member Crowley commented that there is no significant yard space for the two residential units, and only 15 feet to the road seems short compared to others. Ms. Brown stated that they are at 14 ½ feet to the property line and that it is closer than other houses but the Right at Home office building is only 10 feet. She suggested that the front porches and walkability offer a different, more urban type of outdoor space. It is a transition area between commercial and residential.

Member Barbehenn said she likes the proposal and commented that this lot has been calling out for something. She agrees with the idea of a transitional character. She welcomes the increased setback compared to the first revision at the last meeting, and the modification of the parking.

Member Lloyd stated that she read the packet and watched the video from the first session (for which she was absent) and will sign a 'Mullin Rule' form.

Ms. Lloyd asked about energy efficiency; will the development follow the Specialized Energy Code? Mr. Ganek confirmed and said it will have to meet codes. Ms. Lloyd noted that there is excellent solar potential on the south-facing side and asked if they will use it, especially for a rental property. Mr. Ganek said they are exploring it.

Ms. Lloyd asked if a landscape plan will be supplied for the next meeting. Confirmed.

Ms. Lloyd noted that the abutter's (Klein) house is about 25 feet from the property line. She asked if Mr. Klein's assertion (in a letter) that the development is illegal under the bylaw has been responded to. Mr. Fields said he explained that the Zoning Bylaw has been amended from the version that Mr. Klein read, and his other comments are on points that are being looked at.

Public Questions and Comments

Martin Klein said that he spoke with Pam Brown over the weekend. He has no objection in general but the green barrier has to happen and he wants it in writing. He stated that they are putting a business property next to a residential one and he sees the zero setback requirement as a loophole in the law.

Jaqueline Bhalla noted that her driveway at 19 Fletcher Road is opposite the proposed house. She observed that there is a parking prohibition on Fletcher Road here and asked if it will stay. Also she asked about management of vehicles during construction. Mr. Fields confirmed that an on-street parking prohibition is posted and said it would only be changed if the Select Board proposed it.

Lee Vorderer asked if the developer would be willing to make the residential units affordable if the Town made a financial contribution.

Peg Bernhardt responded that they aren't developers, just long-standing small business owners who have housed a few tenants and staff. They care about the town, are involved as volunteers, consider this a beautiful street and want to do the project well. They will use a landscape designer. They need the remaining on-site parking to support the businesses and in case the residential tenants need extra space. In relation to affordable housing, they don't have deep pockets and think they will barely break even on the project. Ted Bernhardt added that they have taken good care of the office building.

Mr. Ganek commented that the proposed house extends the feel of the residential street. Ms. Bernhardt noted that the design also references features in the Blake block development opposite.

Mr. Klein said he doesn't agree that the proposed building is an improvement and repeated his request for written confirmation that the green barrier will be replaced.

Kathy Kerby spoke in support of Mr. Klein. She pointed out that if he'll have a three-story house very close and lose the green barrier, it will be hard to replace in a short time.

Mr. Klein added that his 25 ft setback has no bearing on the applicant's.

Board Discussion

Member Lloyd sought a response to the question about the construction phase. Ms. Brown responded that good practice is to coordinate with neighbors, adding that there will be enough space on site to store materials. The Code Enforcement Department may require some fencing and there are bylaws about construction noise/hours.

Ms. Lloyd asked if it will be possible to keep the row of arborvitae now that the house will be 10 feet off the property line. Ms. Brown observed that they aren't very pretty but are a green barrier. She isn't sure what's practical but they will propose new planting. Ms. Lloyd stated that the developer will be required to do what is shown and agreed on a landscape plan.

In relation to the proposed small street setback, Ms. Lloyd said she thinks it can and does work near the center of town.

Mr. Crowley said he hears that but also notes the rest of Fletcher Road has bigger setbacks.

Member Barbehenn asked if the Board has received departments' comments. Staff will check.

Ms. Barbehenn expressed the view that the setbacks proposed are appropriate for the Center business district. She noted that residents who come will choose it.

Mr. Crowley commented that it is also a loss of green space and will be a bit short on that aspect, although there has been some compromise.

Chair Gittins noted that before voting, the Board will need more input from town departments, information on landscaping, an answer on solar power and further discussion. He asked if the applicant wishes to continue the public hearing. Confirmed. Ms. Brown suggested August 8, with a proviso that she will let staff know if they are not ready.

MOTION: Member Hagan proposed and Member Barbehenn seconded, to continue the public hearing to August 8, 2023

VOTE: By Roll Call:

Todd Crowley	Aye
Amy Lloyd	Aye
Steven Hagan	Aye
Jacinda Barbehenn	Aye
Christopher Gittins	Aye

BUSINESS SESSION

Member Crowley asked if staff could supply any data on residential parking ratios, especially on the viability of one space per unit. Director Fields mentioned studies done by MAPC and agreed to supply what he can find that is relevant.

Elm Street special permit residential development options

Following on from discussion of a potential Center Neighborhood Overlay District, Pam Brown and David Goldbaum supplied a new sketch site plan and unit floor plan for a multiple small unit development on 49 Elm Street.

Chair Gittins noted that the Board didn't want to take on this zoning initiative and wanted to concentrate on MBTA Communities zoning. He asked if this plan is for informational purposes. Ms. Brown said yes but that she would like a reaction. She intends to draft a bylaw for a new zoning district.

Ms. Brown related that the revised units are smaller and the idea is for about 6 units per acre.

David Goldbaum said that he reduced the interior floor area to 1700 sf in response to Board comments about size. He asked if the Board is fixed on not getting it to the next Town Meeting. Chair Gittins confirmed; it is not on the Board's 'to do' list for the lead up to the fall Special Town Meeting.

Mr. Goldbaum asked if there was an avenue for special approval that would allow him to get started on a development before 2024. Ms. Brown noted that if he proposed a bylaw change, the Planning Board would have to hold a public hearing on it.

Chair Gittins noted there have been past discussions and the Board is very busy working on other things.

Member Barbehenn cautioned against spot zoning just for this property and spoke of the need for a full public process; there are a lot of options to explore with similar aims.

Member Lloyd agreed and added that as a detailed comment, she was not sure the square footage is accurate.

Member Barbehenn said she wondered if such ideas could be fitted into MBTA Communities multifamily zoning.

Chair Gittins commented that it is a big undertaking to change zoning near the town center. He could be enthusiastic about it in the future, but would prefer by-right zoning.

Ms. Brown said she didn't think the Board was considering the town center area for MBTA zoning. The Chair responded that MBTA Communities zoning is the next topic.

Members took a five-minute break and returned.

MBTA Communities multifamily zoning

Assistant Planner Perry referred to her memo describing her latest piece of work to test areas against the state's Compliance Model. This one, termed Test 4, examines the residentially-zoned segment of The Great Road between the Shawsheen and Marketplace business districts. Some initial data on properties in this area was provided by Director Fields last time but using the model enables useful maps to be created and unit calculations generated.

The maps show the north and south side groups of parcels, all fronting on Great Road. Their areas are 9 and 12 acres. The map of Excluded land shows limited areas excluded. The map of Sensitive land shows a larger area but Ms. Perry thinks only the flood hazard portion would be a constraint; she has supplied a separate GIS map showing this (in blue).

As a first run of this test, Ms. Perry has input the current zoning dimensional rules for Residence B. Many of the lots generate zero unit capacity due to being nonconforming, but the other ten lots generate significant numbers of units under the model's calculations. A few of them at the southeast corner would be reduced somewhat by the flood hazard constraint. If the minimum lot size parameter was changed, perhaps from 30,000 sf to 20,000, more lots would generate some unit capacity. The standard setbacks and 3 story height limit could feasibly be kept, or changes could be explored if wished.

Ms. Perry observed that the style of houses in this stretch of the road is varied and in general the visual character may derive more from the existence of greenery in front yards than from the buildings, unlike the area closer to the Town campus. Therefore, given that the area is on the #62 bus route and could make a contribution to housing numbers and strengthen nearby businesses, it may be worth considering further.

Member Lloyd commented that she is opposed to designating this area, as there are many historic properties; about half are pre-1939. She also thinks it would be contentious.

Member Barbehenn welcomed the additional information supplied, and said she doesn't want to rule anything out at this stage. She also wants to better understand capability in other areas such as the Stop & Shop property.

Chair Gittins said that he has a suggestion of exploring reducing minimum lot sizes to 10,000 sf and allowing three or four apartments on each; this could be appropriate for near the town center. He noted that there aren't many large parcels near bus routes.

Member Barbehenn expressed support for that idea, since people don't like to see big buildings, and fourplexes on small lots might be an interesting concept.

Mr. Fields reported that our CHAPA group will meet on August 17. Also, on August 16 they will be hosting EOHLC staff to talk about economic feasibility analysis for affordable unit requirements. Mr. Fields will send links to these events.

Mr. Gittins asked about an update on our timeline for MBTA Communities work. Mr. Fields responded that we are still within our Action Plan, although we may not meet an end of August date. He will provide a more detailed update in the next meeting packet.

Board Liaison Reports

Member Crowley reported that TAC and BAC's prioritization of transportation projects has been written up and submitted to the Select Board. He will supply a copy for inclusion in the next meeting packet.

Member Barbehenn reported that the Housing Partnership heard a presentation of an updated version of the Carlisle Road LIP project, responding to the Select Board's last comments. The revision included the east parcel. The Partnership was concerned about the loss of rental opportunities from the west parcel. On Monday, the Select Board discussed the project. Brian de Vellis will submit the original LIP application to move the process along but work with the Town, hopefully to put some rental units back in, and check the ability to apply an age restriction to the senior-oriented apartments.

Member Barbehenn further reported that the Select Board reached no resolution on the Old Billerica Road MOU. They did vote to put the Specialized Energy Code on the Warrant for the fall Special Town Meeting.

Member Hagan said that the ConCom still needs to continue its Notice of Intent hearing on the 1 Railroad Avenue project. The Depot Park Advisory Committee is discussing refurbishments. The Hanscom committees are awaiting the state's Environmental Impact Report.

Chair Gittins noted that the Energy and Sustainability Committee has postponed its meeting to July 31. He couldn't attend the Chamber of Commerce meeting. He listened to the Select Board discussion of the Old Billerica Road MOU and has discussed the Planning Board's options with Mr. Fields.

Staff Updates

Director Fields reported that the new Administrative Assistant will start work on Monday.

The deadline for Bedford Day booths is August 14, so the Board will need to decide on August 8 if it wants to participate. Bedford Day is September 23.

Member Lloyd asked if we have any materials to present at Bedford Day on the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Fields said staff could provide something. Ms. Perry suggested identifying the standard list of topics covered and noting that we can add to or rearrange them. The Board could also put forward ideas about a Steering Committee.

Member Barbehenn suggested also using Bedford Day to publicize MBTA Communities zoning. Ms. Lloyd proposed having a working session on it in August.

Ms. Perry reported that she included an introduction to our MBTA Communities zoning work in her public talk the previous day at the Council on Aging, and has included a copy of her handout in Board packets. There were no questions or comments on that part of the talk, but there was interest in more specific proposals, mansionization and zoning for 2-family dwellings and ADUs, and some DPW matters.

Ms. Perry also reported on Concord's kick-off public meeting on MBTA Communities zoning, which was in a hybrid format and led by consultants.

Minutes

The Board reviewed the minutes of its July 11 meeting.

MOTION: Proposed by Member Barbehenn, seconded by Member Lloyd, to approve the minutes as written

VOTE: By Roll Call:

Amy Lloyd	Aye
Jacinda Barbehenn	Aye
Todd Crowley	Aye
Steven Hagan	Aye
Christopher Gittins	Aye

Member Barbehenn thanked Ms. Perry for preparing the minutes during the long vacancy in support position(s).

Adjournment

MOTION: Proposed by Member Hagan and seconded by Lloyd to adjourn, at 9:48pm.

VOTE: By Roll Call:

Amy Lloyd	Aye
Jacinda Barbehenn	Aye
Todd Crowley	Aye
Steven Hagan	Aye
Christopher Gittins	Aye

Minutes prepared by Catherine Perry. Approved August 22, 2023.

DOCUMENT LIST

Agenda

Briefing memo dated July 21, 2023 from Planning Director D. Anthony Fields, for July 25 Planning Board meeting

One Railroad Avenue – Planning Board submission dated June 8, 2023 (Special permit application, cover letter from Pamela J. Brown, zoning district compliance summary, location map, Google street view photos, GIS map showing zoning, marked up GIS map of parking lot on south side of Railroad Ave., copy of layout plan with colored green areas, copy of unofficial property record card, catalog cuts of indoor and outdoor bike racks)

Plan set for 1 Railroad Avenue, dated as revised July 18, 2023 prepared by BSC Group and Paul Finger Associates (12 sheets including cover sheet)

Architectural drawings and floor plans for 1 Railroad Avenue dated May 16, 2023 prepared by HDS Architecture (5 sheets)

Letter to Planning Board from Reed family, 96 South Road, commenting on the proposed development at 1 Railroad Avenue and offering suggestions

Planning Board Minutes
072523

60 Great Road – Memo dated July 19, 2023 from Pam Brown to Bedford Planning Board re revised plans, attaching colored sketch plan and ‘progress set’ architectural drawings dated July 14 for chosen Option 3 house design

Letter to Planning Board dated July 20, 2023 from Martin Klein (and family), 34 Fletcher Road, expressing concerns about the proposed development at 60 Great Road

Architectural drawings and floor plans for further discussion of potential concept for 49 Elm Street

Memo dated July 21, 2023 from Assistant Planner Catherine Perry to Planning Board re MBTA Communities zoning – progress update, attaching:

- Plans prepared by DPW dated July, 2023 showing District defined for Test 4 with: a) Excluded land and b) Sensitive land
- GIS online map extract showing Flood hazard areas
- Spreadsheet summarizing model outputs including calculated housing unit capacity

“What’s Going on Around Town?” – Handout from Planning Department portion of COA talk on July 24, 2023 by Catherine Perry

Copy of letter from Brian DeVellis to Bedford Housing Partnership and Select Board dated June 29, 2023 re Carlisle Road Bedford LLC

Copy of letter from Stephen M. Andress of 46 Mitchell Grant Way to Bedford Select Board dated July 18, 2023 re Old Billerica Road proposed development and Board’s position

Draft minutes of Planning Board meeting on July 11, 2023

Various press articles on topics of planning interest