

Approved Meeting Minutes
October 10, 2017 Planning Board Meeting
7:00 P.M. | City Council Chamber, Woburn City Hall

Chair Carolyn Turner called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and asked City Planner/Grant Writer Dan Orr to call the roll.

ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Mr. Kevin Donovan, Mr. Bob Doherty, Mr. Jim Callahan, Mr. Michael Ventresca, Mr. Dave Edmonds and Chair Carolyn Turner were present; Ms. Claudia Bolgen was absent. Also present were Planning Director Tina Cassidy and City Planner/Grant Writer Dan Orr.

Chair Carolyn Turner asked Director Cassidy if there were any ANR applications before the Board this evening. Planning Director Cassidy responded that there are two.

369 WASHINGTON STREET ANR PLAN (MADISON WOBURN HOLDINGS, LLC)

Planning Director Cassidy provided an overview of the ANR application. The applicant intends to reconfigure the lot lines of former Lot 1 (519,489) to create two newly-configured parcels with land areas of 454,841 sq. ft. (Lot 1A) and 64,648 sq. ft. (Lot 1B). Lot 1B is not to be considered a building lot and is so labeled on the plan. No new building lots, nor any zoning non-conformities, will be created with the reconfiguration. Newly-configured Lot 1A will have the appropriate amount of street frontage on Washington Street. She recommended the Board endorse the plan as one not requiring approval under the Subdivision Control Law.

Motion to endorse the ANR plan at 369 Washington Street made by Mr. Dave Edmonds;
Seconded by Mr. Bob Doherty;
Motion carried, 6-0-0.

6 TIDD AVENUE ANR PLAN (MS. CONSTANCE CARBONE)

Planning Director Cassidy provided an overview of the ANR application. The plan has been filed pursuant to M.G.L. Chapter 41, Section 81-L, which entitles the subject parcel to ANR endorsement provided the two existing buildings were in existence prior to the City of Woburn's adoption of Subdivision Control Law (1953), and provided that the proposed lots each contain one of the pre-existing buildings. The owner of #6 Tidd Avenue intends to reconfigure the existing lot into two separate lots, including Lot 1 (12,088 sq. ft.) and Lot 2 (22,728 sq. ft.). Because the applicant has provided sufficient evidence of the structures' existence before 1953, staff recommends the Board endorse the plan as an ANR.

Motion to endorse the ANR plan for property at 6 Tidd Avenue made by Mr. Bob Doherty;
Seconded by Mr. Dave Edmonds;
Motion carried, 6-0-0.

24 FLAGG STREET DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION (MR. GEORGE W. GATELY, JR)

Planning Director Cassidy stated that in response to confusion resulting from the abstention of one of the Planning Board members at the last meeting, she would like to review the legal process, for the

benefit of the public, that the Board must follow relative to voting eligibility. She displayed on the screen the State law (M.G.L. Chapter 39, Section 23D) which stipulates the conditions under which Planning Board members can continue to participate in a public hearing following an absence. In Mr. Edmonds' case, he intended to file the required certification forms with the Planning Office by this evening's meeting to be "qualified", but because the public hearing on this matter was closed at the Board's September 26th meeting without those forms having been submitted, he was and is disqualified from further participation on this application.

Planning Director Cassidy further stated that that after speaking with City Solicitor Callahan-Doucette, she would recommend the Board consider adopting a formal policy relative to filing the qualifying forms in cases of Board member absences. Planning Director Cassidy will address the Board in the future relative to consideration and potential adoption of a policy that formally address this issue.

Planning Director Cassidy further stated that she has also spoken with the Solicitor relative to consideration of new correspondence from the general public received after the close of the hearing. Her opinion is that the Board should not accept any new information or written testimony after the public hearing on a matter has been closed; alternatively, the Board may vote to accept the documents for incorporation into the project file.

Mr. Dave Edmonds inquired about potentially re-opening the public hearing to accept new testimony. Planning Director Cassidy responded that she is unaware of any regulation that would permit the re-opening of a public hearing for this purpose.

Attorney Joseph Tarby, Murtha Cullina, 600 Unicorn Park Drive, approached the Board on behalf of the Petitioner to formally request the continuance of discussion on this matter to the Board's November 14, 2017 meeting. The purpose is to allow participation by the maximum number of Board members. In addition, the applicant intends, in the intervening time, to further address outstanding issues relative to the potential relocation of the utility pole and carport that are currently within the public right-of-way.

Chair Turner asked whether the Board would like to take a formal motion to accept the public correspondence, for filing purposes only, as it was submitted after the closure of the public hearing on this matter.

Motion to accept the correspondence documents for the file, subject to non-consideration by the Board on this matter, made by Mr. Michael Ventresca;

Seconded, by Mr. Dave Edmonds, for discussion. He inquired to the Planning Director as to the value of filing such correspondence without consideration. Planning Director Cassidy responded that the filing would simply allow for a complete record correspondence should there ever be an inquiry in the future.

Second withdrawn by Mr. Dave Edmonds;

Motion seconded by Mr. Bob Doherty;

Motion carried, 5-0-1, with Mr. Dave Edmonds abstaining due to ineligibility to vote on this matter.

Motion to continue this matter until the Board's November 14, 2017 meeting, made by Mr. Bob Doherty;

Seconded by Mr. Jim Callahan;

Motion carried, 5-0-1, with Mr. Dave Edmonds abstaining due to ineligibility to vote on this petition.

PETITION TO AMEND THE 1989 WOBURN ZONING ORDINANCES BY ADDING A NEW SECTION 31 (FEDERAL STREET SMART GROWTH OVERLAY DISTRICT [FS/SGOD]) AND OVERLAYING THE FS/SGOD DISTRICT ON 14 AND 14R FEDERAL STREET (Jamieson Properties)

Attorney Joseph Tarby and Mr. Glenn Morris, architect with Morris Architects, 33 Murray Road, Newton, MA, approached the Board on behalf of the Petitioner.

Attorney Tarby stated that since the last meeting, the Petitioner has examined parking conditions at adjacent properties to gather a better sense of parking demand in the vicinity of the proposal. In addition, they are developing a list/profile of existing tenants at their current properties to gather a comprehensive look at actual parking demand.

Attorney Tarby further stated that he still intends to meet with the Planning Director to review the Massachusetts General Law (M.G.L.) Chapter 40R proposal.

Mr. Morris stated that there were a few questions that came up during the last hearing session that they intend to review in presentation form at the Board's November 14th meeting. Relative to the bus routes, there are currently three that connect through the Woburn Common area. To answer the question of access to supermarkets, there are a number of shopping opportunities that are accessible via the Route 134 bus line.

Mr. Morris further provided an overview of the proposed floor areas of the proposed micro-units at its Federal Street site. The micro-units that would be offered are actually larger in size than Jamieson Properties' Montvale Avenue facility. The one-bedroom units would also be comparatively larger.

Attorney Tarby stated that he would like to make a formal request to continue the public hearing until the November 14, 2017 meeting.

Mr. Michael Ventresca stated that questions about the brick façade were raised at the last meeting and he would like to hear more about what is being proposed with the Federal Street project. Mr. Morris stated that they can share some examples of materials, but one of the components of the proposed zoning district is that it integrates a design review process. That would include a comprehensive look at lighting, signage and building material aspects of the project.

Chair Carolyn Turner opened this matter for a public hearing and asked any members of the audience who would like to step forward to address the Board to please do so.

PUBLIC HEARING

There being no members of the audience wanting to address the Board, Chair Carolyn Turner asked for a motion.

Motion to continue the public hearing on this matter until November 14, 2017, at 7:00 p.m., made by Mr. Dave Edmonds;
Seconded by Mr. Bob Doherty;
Motion carried, 6-0-0.

PETITION TO AMEND SECTION 11.11 (SUBSECTIONS 1, 3, 4 AND 5) OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE (AFFORDABLE HOUSING REQUIREMENT) BY (A) INCREASING AFFORDABLE HOUSING REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO SPECIAL PERMIT PETITIONS FROM 10% TO 25% OF UNITS; (B) EXPANDING THE APPLICABILITY TO INCLUDE USES WHERE DWELLING UNITS ARE LOCATED ABOVE FIRST STORIES IN COMMERCIAL STRUCTURES; (C) DELETING THE OPTION OF OFFSITE AFFORDING HOUSING UNITS BY PETITIONER REQUEST; AND (D) DELETING A CASH PAYMENT OPTION TO SATISFY AFFORDABLE UNIT REQUIREMENTS IN CASES WHERE THE NUMBER OF REQUIRED AFFORDABLE UNITS RESULTS IN FRACTIONS BELOW 1 (Alderman Joanne Campbell)

Planning Director Cassidy stated that due to a scheduling conflict Alderman Joanne Campbell has requested that the Board defer discussion on this matter until the Board's next meeting on October 24, 2017, so that she may be present to explain the zoning amendment proposal.

Chair Carolyn Turner opened this matter for a public hearing and asked any members of the audience who would like to step forward to address the Board to please do so.

PUBLIC HEARING

There being no members of the audience wishing to address the Board, Chair Turner asked for a motion.

Motion to continue the public hearing on this matter until November 14, 2017, at 7:00 p.m., made by Mr. Bob Doherty;
Seconded by Mr. Dave Edmonds;

Mr. Michael Ventresca inquired about the timing of the proposed hearing and the purpose of being "time-certain" at 7:00 p.m. Planning Director Cassidy responded that by setting each hearing at 7:00 p.m. when the meeting commences, it will ensure that every potential public hearing attendee will be present by the time the hearing they are interested in starts.

Motion carried, 6-0-0.

285 LOCUST STREET PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAN (285 Locust Street LLC)

Attorney Mark Vaughn, Riemer & Braunstein, 7 District Ave # 800, Burlington, MA, and Brian Tim, project engineer with RJ O'Connell & Associates, 80 Montvale Ave. #201, Stoneham, MA, approached the Board representing the Petitioner.

Attorney Vaughn stated that the plans submitted demonstrate how four lots could be configured within the R-3 zoning district with a short cul-de-sac. The preliminary plan is proposed to "lock into place" the current zoning provisions.

Attorney Vaughn stated that the project proposal requires no waivers and complies with all of the City's Subdivision Rules and Regulations.

Planning Director Cassidy provided an overview of the current department comments to date. All departments except the Department of Public Works and Fire Department have provided comments. Considerations need to be given to traffic flow/impact, building envelopes, private maintenance of drainage systems, and reviews of any environmental hazards.

Planning Director Cassidy further noted that there is no cross-section included in the current application plan set. Mr. Tim responded that a cross-section sheet would be included in a definitive plan set; the applicant intended for a conceptual review only at this stage.

Mr. Dave Edmonds inquired about what is on the site presently. Mr. Tim responded that there is currently a vacant building on the site and the site is approximately 95% paved. The proposed development would decrease impervious surface and improve infiltration on the site.

Mr. Dave Edmonds asked whether building four single-family homes is the actual plan that will be constructed under current zoning. Attorney Vaughn stated that this subdivision plan will likely not move forward post-approval. The intent of the submission of this plan is to “freeze” the current zoning regulations that apply to the parcel. He does not want to convey that the Petitioner would definitely be moving forward with construction of single-family homes; townhomes do remain an option.

Mr. Dave Edmonds asked what could be potentially constructed on the site based on the parcel’s current zoning. Attorney Vaughn responded that under current zoning the Petitioner could construct 4 single-family homes with Planning Board approval or approximately 41 townhomes via a Special Permit from the City Council. Currently, the site is a pre-existing, non-conforming use.

Mr. Dave Edmonds further inquired about what the final lot would look like if it were to be “maximized.” Attorney Vaughn responded that it could be maximized as one lot with one access driveway.

Mr. Tim stated that currently the direct abutters around the property are multi-family communities.

Mr. Michael Ventresca inquired about the roadway configuration. Attorney Vaughn stated there may not be a subdivision road; it may take the form of a townhome access driveway or a subdivision cul-de-sac.

Chair Carolyn Turner inquired as to what the applicant would intend to do to examine traffic conditions per comments provided by the Chief of Police. Attorney Vaughn stated that the applicant fully intends to engage a traffic consultant to address this issue, regardless of the project that is definitively pursued.

Mr. Jim Callahan further stated that he would like a little more time to examine the plan. However, he is not “keen” on the approach of the zoning “placeholder” that is intended by this application. He is not opposed to the process, but he would appreciate seeing an actual plan for a larger-scale residential concept.

Mr. Bob Doherty inquired about the purpose of a preliminary subdivision. Planning Director Cassidy stated that preliminary plans are typically filed to receive initial feedback from City departments to help refine a definitive plan design and to expedite the definitive subdivision approval process. The current application is different in that it intends to pre-empt a current zoning amendment petition (i.e., potential increase to the affordable housing requirement) that would have a significant impact on the potential project. The “freeze” on the current zoning would be in effect for 7 years if the preliminary is followed within a certain amount of time by a definitive plan that is ultimately approved.

Mr. Bob Doherty further inquired as to whether the filing is approved or disapproved has an effect on the next step. Planning Director stated that regardless of the Board’s decision on the preliminary plan, the applicant is free to file a definitive plan, as the preliminary plan is not binding.

Mr. Jim Callahan inquired about the timeline for the Board’s decision on this application. Planning Director Cassidy responded that the Board has 45 days from submission to review this matter. This would make the deadline November 13th. The Board may want to consider continuing this matter until its October 24th meeting as to allow more time to receive additional departmental comments.

Mr. Jim Callahan inquired about whether the preliminary plan, if approved, would need to be recorded. Planning Director Cassidy stated that any approved preliminary plan would not need to be recorded with the Registry of Deeds, as it is not considered to be the final plan.

Chair Carolyn Turner inquired as to whether there was any further testimony this evening from the Petitioner. Attorney Vaughn stated that he has nothing further to add other than that the Board should be assured that all of their concerns would be addressed during the definitive subdivision application process.

Chair Carolyn Turner inquired about a recommendation. Planning Director stated that she recommends continuance of this matter until the Board’s next meeting on October 24, 2017.

Motion to continue this matter until the Board’s October 24, 2017 meeting, made by Mr. Dave Edmonds;
Seconded by Mr. Jim Callahan;
Motion carried, 6-0-0.

DOWN’S COURT SUBDIVISION (Mr. Fred Cialdea)

Planning Director Cassidy stated that this agenda item cannot move forward in its entirety, as we are waiting for a Treasurer’s check from the Petitioner, final feedback from the City Solicitor relative to easement documents, and confirmation of recordation of a previously-approved Homeowners’ Association declaration and bylaws document. However, it is appropriate at this time for the Board to approve a bond amount of \$63,000 per the Engineering Department’s recommendation.

Motion set the bond amount for the Down’s Court subdivision at \$63,000, made by Mr. Dave Edmonds;
Seconded by Mr. Bob Doherty;
Motion carried, 6-0-0.

FREMONT STREET EXTENSION SUBDIVISION (Seaver Properties, LLC)

Director Cassidy reviewed the request which had been submitted the Department of Public Works for review and comment this past summer. After several months, the developer has successfully been able to complete the required patchwork remaining to the satisfaction of Public Works Superintendent. Planning staff thusly recommends the release of the remaining bond monies held in the amount of \$7,500.

Motion to release the remaining bond monies, in the amount of \$7,500, held to guarantee subdivision completion, made by Mr. Dave Edmonds;

Seconded by Mr. Bob Doherty;

Motion carried, 6-0-0.

DRAGON COURT SUBDIVISION (GARVEY ROAD) (Murray Hills)

Chair Carolyn Turner recused herself from discussion of this matter and Mr. Michael Ventresca assumed the role of Chair pro tem for the remainder of the meeting.

Director Cassidy reviewed the latest correspondence relative to this matter and the issues surfacing during construction of this subdivision. She summarized the issues that have been brought to the attention of the Board: noise, lack of dust control measures, potential violation of two conditions of approval (mature tree preservation and hours of construction activity) and an abutter's concern about potential damages to trees on his property when the swale is built.

Director Cassidy further stated the Building Commissioner has been making site visits to the project location to monitor the home building activity occurring. She stated the Engineering Department, in fact, is the one that assists the Board and Planning Department during subdivision construction not the Department of Inspectional Services. However, the Building Commissioner does assist the Planning Board on mutual issues such as dust violations.

Planning Director Cassidy further stated that she would like to review Sheet G-1 of the approved plan set which shows the location and the caliper of the trees that existed on the site at the time the project was approved. The question for the Board is whether there were any mature trees that could have been preserved. To reiterate, the developer maintains that the combination of grading work, home and road construction, and utility work is what led to the need to cut down all trees on site.

Planning Director Cassidy provided an overview of sheet G-1 which depicts the three clusters of mature trees, including one that is on an abutting property. That is at least one mature tree that the abutter is concerned may be negatively affected by upcoming swale construction. Although not all tree calipers were noted, the grading work may give an indication of whether trees should have been conserved.

Mr. Bob Doherty stated that without having expertise on this matter, he believes that the developer overstepped and eliminated mature trees where he should not have, but there is no way to definitively prove that.

Mr. Bob Doherty further stated that he does not believe the Board took the step at that time to specifically identify mature trees for preservation and that the intent of the condition was to leave the preservation of mature trees to the developer's discretion.

Mr. Bob Doherty inquired about the process of modifying the swale from what is currently shown on the plan and whether it could be moved to lessen its impact on abutting properties. Planning Director Cassidy responded that the developer would need to construct the project in accordance with the approved plan unless a formal modification is sought. She said it was her opinion the developer would likely be reluctant to seek a modification due to the resulting time/construction delay and expense, and the potential for an appeal during the 20-day appeal period that would follow. In addition, it is not certain that moving the swale from its current position within the easement would completely allay abutters' concerns relative to trees.

Mr. Bob Doherty stated that he understands that a modification would result in another public hearing and decision process, but perhaps that is what needs to be done to preserve abutting trees. Planning Director Cassidy responded that she does not believe the Board could ever guarantee the health of abutting trees relative to construction work, but she asked a representative of the developer to ensure that whatever can be done to mitigate potential damage to abutting trees is done (i.e., committing to certain construction techniques or approaches that would minimize or eliminate the issue).

Planning Director further stated that, if the Board agrees and so chooses, she can communicate that sentiment formally to the developer as the Board's request.

Planning Director Cassidy stated more carefully worded conditions would benefit the Board going forward.

Mr. Jim Callahan asked if the developer has provided any information relative to the "zones of influence" in constructing home foundations. He had not.

Mr. Jim Callahan asked the Planning Director to formally ask the developer to provide information as to its decision-making process for removing trees within the three mature tree areas and how the "zones of influence" during construction impacted those trees. Based on his interpretation of the plan, he disagrees with the notion that all mature trees needed to be removed.

Chair pro tem Ventresca stated that his reading of the prior meeting minutes excerpts and videos indicated the Board was clearly concerned with mature tree preservation throughout the public hearing process. It now looks like the developer did indeed remove trees that should not have been removed. The Board is owed a formal response from the developer as to the reasoning for tree removal in error and how that action will be addressed.

Chair pro tem Ventresca further stated that he is in support of inviting the developer to address the Board in-person to agree upon a plan for a course of action moving forward.

Chair pro tem Ventresca further stated that not only was the Board concerned with tree removal but it stipulated Department of Public Works review of tree species and indicated that it would determine the number of new trees to be planted.

Chair pro tem Ventresca asked the Planning Director about the hours of operation condition. Planning Director Cassidy stated that she and the building inspector received assurances after the initial violation complaint that the developer had taken steps to ensure compliance. Despite that, she received a second complaint that contractors were working on the Columbus Day holiday.

Planning Director Cassidy further stated that she spoke to the developer's representative expressing her concern with the second apparent violation, especially after having communicated on this issue previously and receiving assurances it would be resolved. She anticipates follow up correspondence from the developer's representative by tomorrow on this point.

Chair pro tem Ventresca stated that the Board cannot prevent a past violation of the permitted hours of construction activity. He inquired as to the recourse for an abutter if this occurs again, particularly if City Hall is closed at the time a violation is noticed. Planning Director Cassidy stated that in this particular case the abutter could have contacted City Hall departments via email to solicit a response, even though it was a government holiday. She would have personally been able to immediately forward the complaint to the Building Commissioner or the developer. Fundamentally, and for future reference by others, all subdivision-related construction complaints should be addressed to the Planning Director, with a copy to the Chair of the Board.

Mr. Dave Edmonds stated that it seems that the developer is making a series of mistakes but the Board cannot necessarily require corrective action. The response should be for the Board make a request to the developer to appear before the Board to discuss these issues and answer these violations, as well as how the violations will be addressed/mitigated. Chair pro tem Ventresca agreed that there are more than enough allegations of violating Planning Board conditions to make a request of this kind.

Mr. Dave Edmonds further stated that one of the Board's responsibilities is to be mindful of project landscaping and its execution.

Chair pro tem Ventresca inquired about the request made by the abutter to issue a cease and desist. Planning Director Cassidy stated that the work of concern to the abutter involves construction of the swale, and that construction hasn't started so there is nothing to either cease or desist at present. Moreover, she stated that when it does begin, it is work authorized by the Board via its inclusion on the approved plan. A cease and desist cannot be issued for work being done in accordance with an approved plan. Director Cassidy wondered aloud if the abutting property owner is really looking for an injunction in the Superior Court to prevent the swale's construction. The Planning Board should certainly be made aware of past future violations of Board conditions of approval to prevent them in the future.

Mr. Jim Callahan asked if any work has been conducted on the proposed swale. Planning Director Cassidy stated that the tree removal has already taken place but that grading work remains.

Mr. Jim Callahan stated that it is important for the developer to address this issue over the long term by a professional arborist to mitigate the construction impact and seek out the best methods for salvaging roots of trees on abutting properties.

Planning Director Cassidy asked Mr. Jim Callahan for clarity, if he was suggesting the developer consult a trained professional prior to his meeting with the Board. Mr. Jim Callahan responded that they can either take that approach or bring a professional arborist with them to address the Board to answer tree salvaging-related questions.

Planning Director Cassidy stated that she would be cautious about requiring consultation with a certified arborist on this matter, as the developer is limited in that he cannot make substantial design changes. She recommends that the Board frame consultation with an arborist as a strong recommendation as opposed to a requirement. Mr. Jim Callahan responded that he would agree with the wording of "strong recommendation."

Mr. Robert Doherty stated that there have been a number of times in the past in which developers have asked the Board to modify their plans to mitigate costs.

Mr. Robert Doherty inquired about police enforcement of hours of construction limitations. Planning Director Cassidy stated that she is not certain of what a police response would be in this type of scenario, but it is conceivable that police would respond to a reported violation of municipal code.

Mr. Robert Doherty stated that he sympathizes with the aggrieved abutting property owner given his personal experience with construction impacts adjacent to his home. The removal of trees has already occurred, but it is important to speak to the developer as to why violations of construction hours keep occurring.

Mr. Kevin Donovan stated that it would be beneficial to have the developer bring in a field contractor to the next meeting for potential questioning also.

Chair pro tem Ventresca inquired as to whether a formal motion is necessary. Planning Director Cassidy stated that a formal vote is not needed and she can simply inform the developer of the Board's requests as discussed this evening and extend the invitation to appear at their next meeting.

Chair pro tem Ventresca inquired as to whether any further complaints have arisen as to dust controls. Planning Director Cassidy responded that she has not received any further complaints on that issue.

Mr. Dave Edmonds inquired about what might happen if the developer does not show up. Planning Director Cassidy responded that she would consider next steps at that point if it happened.

Chair pro tem Ventresca stated that it would be best to invite the developer to the October 24th meeting and that he should be informed prior to that meeting about the latest concerns and requests made by the Board. Planning Director Cassidy stated that she would be in touch with the developer over the next couple of days.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: September 26, 2017 regular meeting

Chair Ventresca asked if everyone had reviewed the minutes of the last meeting.

Motion to accept the September 26, 2017 meeting minutes as submitted, made by Mr. Dave Edmonds;
 Seconded by Mr. Bob Doherty;
 Motion carried, 5-0-0.

PLANNING BOARD DIRECTOR UPDATE

Planning Director Cassidy stated that she has no further Planning Board applications or hearing updates at this time. She added that Planning Staff continue to await further news on a remote meeting equipment demo in the near future.

ADJOURNMENT

Seeing no further business, at 8:44, motion to end the meeting was made by Mr. Bob Doherty;
 Seconded by Mr. Dave Edmonds;
 Motion carried, 5-0-0.

Table of Documents Used at Meeting

Staff Report
ANR Application for 369 Washington Street
ANR Application for 6 Tidd Avenue
24 Flagg Street Subdivision: draft decision letter of Board approval; draft decision letter of Board denial
Petition to Amend 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinances (Federal Street Smart Growth Overlay District)
Petition to Amend Section 11.11 (Subsections 1, 3, 4 and 5)
285 Locust Street Preliminary Subdivision Application
285 Locust Street Preliminary Subdivision: Written department comments from the Engineering, Police, Public Works, Building, and the Board of Health
Downs Court Subdivision: Engineering memo re: bond request recommendation
Fremont Street Subdivision: Public Works memo re: bond release recommendation
Dragon Court Subdivision: Planning Board conditions of approval; Sheet G-1 of the Plan of Record