

Planning Board Minutes: November 26, 2013

Attending: Bernie Cahill (BC), Chair; Max Lamson (ML), Vice Chair; Gregory Tuzzolo (GT); Kevin Calzia (KC); and Jason Kreil (JK), Alternate. Absent: Chuck Shea (CS). Also attending representing the Town of Maynard, Eric R. Smith, AICP, Town Planner.

At 7:05 P.M. BC called the meeting to order.

7:05p.m. Public Hearing, Fowler Street Extension Definitive Plan

BC re-opened the Public Hearing indicating this was a continuation of the Fowler Street Extension Definitive Plan that was held on Tuesday, November 12, 2013. BC apologized for meeting the meeting two weeks ago as he had been feeling under the weather.

ES indicated that BC was going to file Mullins form for missing the last meeting and ML will be filing one for missing the October 22nd Public Hearing.

BC addressed Mark Donohoe (MD), Acton Surveying and Engineering, to have him provide an update on the Fowler Street Extension Definitive Plan and progress since last meeting with identification of outstanding issues.

MD: We did meet last week with Eric (Town Planner) and Wayne (Amico, Town Engineer) to discuss the subdivision and I think we only have three (3) outstanding issues. Well four (4) including cost, or the differential cost, between what is required by your bylaw and what is proposed.

MD discussed the first outstanding issue related to granite curbing. MD noted the Applicant is proposing sloped granite that would be backed with concrete joints. MD provided a photo example of one of such installations.

MD: We did add an additional tree as well as language that at the time before the Building Commissioner grants the last Building Permit, the subdivision be reviewed and if additional trees are needed and inadequate amount are preserved, a decision will be made to add trees.

MD on the treebox filter issue of elevation indicated that Wayne wants the treebox filter(s) to be at the same elevation. MD: If you want us to lower one, we will lower one, but they are at different levels as that is part of the Stormwater management system design. MD and WA agreed to review this issue further.

MD: The last thing is that Wayne/VHB came up with some cost estimates. We also came up with some cost estimates, adding some things that were missing: such as the T-Turnaround, granite curbing, and the addition of a waterline to where we would be putting in the spare conduit. We came up with a difference of \$15,000 between what the subdivision is requiring and what the Applicant may actually spend. This includes the repaving of the entire Fowler Street up until the intersection with Parker Street.

MD noted that \$15,000 on a project this size could be gone in a short time. He noted examples of, if instead of milling the existing Fowler Street, some sections would have to be replaced.

BC: Can you explain where the water main is going to? MD: From our water line (in the Fowler Extension) to the cemetery. BC followed up by asking where in the cemetery it would connect to. Wayne Amico (WA): This was added at the DPW's request in case for future expansion at the cemetery. MD: It would end just at the property line (between the subdivision and the cemetery).

Marty Maria, the developer of the proposed Fowler Street Extension, along with MD noted that they are proposing to pave two parking spaces across from 9 Fowler Street. MD: We will also be landscaping in front of the Sullivan house, since we will be removing existing pavement in that section, with his permission of course.

BC asked WA to provide any follow-up or if he had anything to add regarding MD's discussion.

WA asked if the Board members had a copy of his letter sent out yesterday (November 25th). The Board indicated that yes they rec'd a copy. WA then provided a review of his letter indicating that there were a couple of issues that appeared to remain as outstanding.

WA: One is that you (MD) just need to discuss with the Board what type of Bond or Covenant is going to be required.

WA: For erosion controls, we made a comment about the sock. Mark did you address that? MD: We will be filing with the Conservation Commission for a Notice of Intent. WA: Our interpretation/understanding is that is what they are looking for nowadays.

WA: In regards to our previous comments related to curbing, berm, sidewalks, loaming, the Board appeared to be acceptable with the 18' roadway width, lack of asphalt berm, the sloped granite, and the lack of sidewalk. We stated our understanding that the Board is satisfied with the plan as being presented with those amenities.

WA noted he would have a follow-up discussion with MD regarding the treebox filter grading issue.

WA: What about the Construction Phase Pollution Prevention Program (CPPP) Mark? MD: As of the Stormwater Report, we will be appearing before the Conservation Commission and also will put the CPPP on the Definitive Plans.

WA noted these were the only remaining issues.

MD: We are replacing the sign at Parker Street and also adding a Stop Sign.

BC indicated that he had a few items to discuss after his reading of the November 12th meeting minutes. BC noted that it appeared the Board was completely on-board with the sloped versus vertical granite, but he asked if the Board members could provide their input on this matter now.

KC: I think we agreed as long as it is done properly, as Mark said it would be constructed, we were comfortable with the sloped granite curbing.

BC asked GT about his concerns related to the property line along Lot 1 and 2 and the fact that lot 2 extends briefly along the turnaround there. GT indicated he understands now why the lot line is located there, but it is more of a pet peeve than anything else, but doesn't detract from the development. MD noted the lot line layout was required to meet the minimum frontage.

BC noted we will be keeping the hearing open past tonight; we are waiting on the Treebox Filter Report. BC then asked if there was anything else remaining outstanding.

The Board then discussed with WA and MD the status of remaining issues in regards to continuing the public hearing versus closing it and then allowing submittal of additional information.

MD noted that the Applicants have granted an extension for the Fowler Street Extension Deadline Decision deadline to December 17th. ES confirmed that the Board has rec'd this extension request letter and brought said letter forth to the Chairman.

MD indicated he thought it was best to keep the Public Hearing open at this time and resolve the last two issues. BC concurred with MD.

ES indicated he was planning to bring a Draft Decision for the Board to review and discuss at the next meeting.

MD then indicated they should discuss the Covenant/Bond issue. ES indicated that the Developer had discussed making use of a Tri-Party Agreement form of security. ES then noted he was unsuccessful at trying to obtain an example from his former community, the Town of Ashburnham. ES also noted he had used a Tri-Party Agreement template from a Massachusetts planning resource, but was unable to find that as well. WA indicated that he could provide the Town Planner and the Developer with a Tri-Party Agreement example from the Town of West Boylston, which is one of the other communities that Wayne works with.

BC requested a summary of the Covenant and Tri-Party Agreement performance guarantee process, which was subsequently provided by the Town Planner.

ML: Along the cemetery lot line, there is a utility easement, but the lot lines are different there too. MD replied by explaining that by reconfiguring the subdivision to push development away from the ice-contact slope, with the road layout further south, they had to adjust the rear lot lines of Lots 2, 3 and 4 in order to get the required minimum 10,000 square feet for Lots 2 and 3. MD then noted they decided to put the easement along the proposed 5' fence maintenance protection and utility easement.

BC: Regarding the tree line visible from the (Parker) Street, are those really tall trees on the cemetery side? Rosemary Lent, 10 Fowler Street: I believe those are on my side.

BC asked the Town Planner if he had any concerns regarding this matter. ES noted that we did have previous discussions on the shape of the rear portions of Lots 2-4, as GT had raised his concerns with the proposed shapes. ES indicated they do meet the zoning requirements as the Town of Maynard does not have any specific lot shape or lot regularity zoning requirements.

ML: A question regarding the cost differential. I think you (Mark) mentioned your cost differential is \$15,000. Then Wayne did his (cost differential analysis) too. Are you guys the same? Did you come to an agreement on that? ML asked for Wayne to discuss his numbers.

WA: I did a quick overall review to compare the 26-foot subdivision roadway versus what is proposed. I did that by saying that 200 feet of the existing Fowler Street is going to be milled and overlaid and 300 feet new construction. What I wasn't clear on, and maybe Mark can explain to the Board, when I read your letter I couldn't get the math to add up correctly. But perhaps maybe I missed something.

MD: I added it up again and it was correct.

WA: The bottom line is that on the quick estimate that I did is that for construction of 300 feet of a new 18-foot roadway would be \$35,000. That would be versus \$70,000 for the subdivision standard roadway of 26 feet. This was offset by \$10,000 for the mill and overlay and several issues that Mark had listed including the turnaround, extension of waterline/conduit to the cemetery, plus the sloped granite curbing. So basically he is accounting for another \$10,000, so the differential becomes \$15,000 versus the \$25,000 I had applied. MD: Correct. And that \$15,000 could be gone in a moment.

BC noted that the proposal now includes the addition of the water line since the meeting he missed plus the spare conduit in case the Town wanted to run cable/Internet service to the cemetery shed building.

ML asked about status of allocation of funds to a sidewalk account. ES indicated that was subject of discussion with him, WA and MD last week. ES noted that he thought about that a lot since the last hearing. Given that the Applicant is proposing to provide the easement, bringing the waterline, conduit and electrical service, I think it is a public benefit bringing this infrastructure to the Town's Cemetery building. ML: So that is now something we could discuss during deliberations. ES concurred.

BC asked WA what convinced him on the vertical versus slanted curbing. WA: For the record nothing has convinced me. I still don't think that is the right thing to do. But the Board seemed OK with it. BC: I guess I'm on your side then, we should stick with vertical. ES indicated there was discussion last time, with issue raised by KC, as to what the Board could do to ensure the construction will be done adequately. ES noted there would be inspections done during the construction process by the DPW/Town Engineer. ES indicated also that Mark Donohoe has provided the plan detail showing concrete on both sides of the sloped curve. The Board had further discussions related to the consideration of allowing the sloped/slanted curbing as part of its Fowler Street Extension subdivision decision.

BC asked the Town Planner if he had any issues he wanted to raise. ES: Mark has provided the Parker Street/Fowler Street intersection details information into the plans and it is incorporated in Sheet 9.

BC opened up the Hearing for Public Comment. There was no public comment.

BC then read the Applicant's letter requesting an extension for the decision deadline for the Fowler Street Extension Definitive Plan into the record. The extension would allow the time to take final action on this Definitive Plan be extended until December 17, 2013.

After further discussion, BC made a Motion to approve the extension request for the final decision of the Fowler Street Extension Definitive Plan to be extended until to December 17, 2013. Seconded by ML. There was no discussion on the Motion. Vote 5 to 0 to approve this request.

BC made a Motion to continue the Public Hearing for the Fowler Street Extension Definitive Plan to Tuesday, December 10th @ 7:35p.m. Seconded by GT. Vote to approve 4 to 0.

Approval of Minutes:

October 8, 2013 Meeting Minutes: ES indicated that at the November 12th meeting he had distributed a set of Draft Meeting Minutes from the Board's October 8, 2013 meeting, but there was not a quorum of members present at that meeting. Therefore he was hoping the Board members had reviewed those meeting minutes for approval tonight. BC confirmed he had received and read those meeting minutes. After discussion, KC made a Motion to approve the October 8, 2013 Planning Board meeting minutes as written. Seconded by BC. Vote 4 to 0. JK did not vote as he did not attend that meeting.

October 22, 2013 Meeting Minutes: ES indicated he distributed the set of Draft Meeting Minutes from the October 22nd meeting to the Board with tonight's Meeting Agenda. BC asked ML if that was the meeting he missed. ML confirmed. The Board members indicated they had reviewed these meeting minutes. BC then made a Motion to approve the October 22, 2013 Planning Board meeting minutes as written. Seconded by KC. Vote 3 to 0. ML and JK did not vote as they both did not attend that meeting.

Old/New Business

Fast Food Restaurant Special Permit Application:

ES indicated to the Board members that the Planning Board has a Special Permit application for a fast food restaurant. The proposal, submitted by Sultan Salahuddin, is to open a Pizza Shop in the vacant space on the right side of Fine Arts Theatre, 17 Summer Street. ES indicated the Public Hearing for the proposed Pizza Shop will be held at the next Planning Board meeting, December 10th @ 7:05p.m.

BC did note that there is no sidewalk curb cut in the area of Summer Street near the Theatre in location Glendale Street. The Board held further discussions on this matter. ES and WA would look into this matter further and conduct a site visit.

McDonald's "temporary exit" onto Main Street:

ES indicated after speaking with Jason and the Building Commissioner he was able to locate the files for this Project. ES then thanked Jason for the dates the matter of the McDonalds temporary exit came before the Board, as it was after the Board's Special Permit decision for the reconstruction of McDonalds. ES noted he found the meeting minutes from the August 24, 2010, which was after the Board's decision, and distributed these meeting minutes to the Board members. ES quoted from the August 24, 2010 the meeting minutes when Myron Fox, Attorney representing McDonalds, appeared before the Board along with John Cusiak, Bohler Engineering and Tessa Bernstein from McDonalds: *"We are here tonight requesting a temporary delay of the three years to complete the Acton Street driveway. We will use the existing driveway on Main Street. This is not a change of site plan, but because DOT as an easement on that property for bridge reconstruction. This is a temporary easement to DOT granted by the property owner.* ES: You can see ultimately when they granted the Modification, they included four (4) Conditions. He directed the Board to look at the last one: *"That the entrance on Acton Street will be completed six months after the release of the Department of Transportation easement"*. ES: That kind of is your timing. I know that is why Max had brought this matter up for discussion. WA: I have been listening curiously as I am coordinating with DOT about the bridge construction. ES and the Board briefed WA about the temporary exit matter regarding McDonalds and the status of the plans to have the final exit onto Acton Street construction.

WA: Isn't DOT constructing that exit point for them as part of the bridge work? I think they are. WA briefed the Board on his knowledge of the bridge construction related to the McDonalds exit and noted he has a set of plans. JK: Eric has the plans on file that are referenced in the Board's decision. That is the plan that should be referenced. Everything that was changed, was post decision. I don't think the Board is particularly concerned about who reconstructs it as long as it is completed. And ultimately that the current curb cut right on the corner goes away. WA indicated he would confirm with DOT on what they are planning to do. He would then pass the information onto the Planning Board.

7:45 p.m. Discussion: Review of Preliminary Plan of Land, filed by Capital Group entitled Preliminary Subdivision Plan, LSREF2 CLOVER RE02, LLC, Map 25 Lot 152, 129 Parker Street, Maynard, Middlesex County" filed on October 11, 2013 showing four (4) lots.

BC noted it was just past 7:45 and that he would like to open up the discussion of the 4-lot Preliminary Plan for 129 Parker Street, including the Draft decision that was prepared by the Town Planner. He also noted this was a continuation of the discussion and review of this Plan that was held on November 26, 2013. ES distributed his most recent Draft decision for the 129 Parker Street Preliminary Plan that he completed today.

BC asked the Applicant to come up and present the Plan.

Bernie Temple of Holden Engineering (BT) introduced himself and indicated he recently submitted updated plans to the Town Planner. BT: They are pretty much the same (plans), we just added the outside roadway information. The Board members were provided with a set of said plans and subsequently reviewed this information. BT noted the plans now show Field Street and Dettling Road.

BT: We are looking for Preliminary Plan Approval. The roadway is 1,200 feet long. As you know, we will be applying for a waiver when we get to the definitive plan. The roadway follows the existing roadway. We tried to maintain the existing trees that on are the side (of the road) and the drainage is pretty much identical to what is there. We would be cutting into a couple of basins. It is a 4-lot subdivision. There is not that much to say about it.

BC asked the Town Planner to provide the Board with his input first. First BC asked if there was a definitive opinion of the Board related to the public versus private roadway for the proposed road. He couldn't quite clearly tell after reviewing the recording. ES indicated he could not speak for the Board, but noted in the Draft Decision there were three (3) outstanding issues and one is related to the matter of the public/private status/determination of the roadway. BC was wondering if it was Greg who had raised this issue. GT confirmed.

ES: Kevin emailed me today with some comments related to the roadway design. He asked Kevin to provide a summary of his comments to the Board and the Applicant. KC: My comment was just that the road is straight and, for lack of a better word, dull. Not knowing what the uses are going to be, and not sure if that's appropriate for the uses, but if the uses would lend to it, I thought it would be nicer to have some bends, or curves, to it. This is from a purely aesthetic perspective. I don't have any information to back this up, but I think it might also improve safety to prevent drivers from speeding down the road if it was a straight line. I don't know if this is appropriate to bring up now or when they have the Definitive Plan and when they will know what the uses are.

BC: For a Preliminary Plan we have 45 days from date of submission (to render a decision), correct? ES: We do, but the applicant was kind enough to give us a 48-hour extension. The 45-day mark was yesterday. So we now have an extension through tomorrow. BC: Also, it is my understanding, and reading from my notes, that approval of a Preliminary Plan does not constitute or guarantee approval of a subdivision or a definitive plan. But is intended to facilitate the procedure in securing the final approval of a definitive plan. BC: In other words we can approve this as is if we wish, but that doesn't guarantee that the definitive plan will meet our approval as well.

JK: Hence, Eric's note of the three (3) items that should be addressed prior to Definitive. BC: Right. ES indicated the Board could discuss if Kevin's comment would render a 4th item.

BC asked if there were any other comments, questions or concerns of the Board members.

GT: Not at the Preliminary (Plan) Stage.

ML: I think I am good too. I was just double-checking the requirements for a preliminary plan and we covered all that last time.

KC: For the outstanding issue #1 (Location of Buildings in a General Manner) I'm OK. For #2 (Proposed roadway exceeds the 500-foot limit of the Board's Subdivision Rules and Regulations, Section IVA4) did we have any feedback from the fire chief? I don't recall seeing that and we have a 1,200-foot roadway. ES indicated that the Fire Chief/Fire Department is not one of the required departments/board to get a copy of the Definitive Plan; it is the DPW, Board of Health and the Conservation Commission who are required to receive copies of the submitted Preliminary Plans. ES also indicated that he did not have time to contact the Fire Chief, but suggested that the Applicant reach out to the Fire Chief before submitting the Definitive Plans with the Planning Board.

BC asked the Town Planner if JK would sit in place to vote in CS's absence. ES indicated that JK, as the Alternate Planning Board member, only has voting privileges for Special Permits, but certainly he can provide his input. JK indicated he did not have any comments at this time.

BC indicated he was satisfied at this time but did inquire if Wayne Amico, Town Engineer, had any additional comments/concerns. WA: I am reviewing my notes from last time and the Applicant indicated he was going to add the adjacent streets, and they have done that. And you noted they are going to request the waiver for the road exceeding the 500-foot dead end limit at the Definitive stage.

BC indicated if the Board was ready to discuss reviewing the Draft Decision and putting the matter before a Vote of the Board. ES inquired if the Board wanted to add a sentence regarding the roadway design per KC's earlier comment. The Board discussed this matter further and decided to keep the existing language, although they noted the ultimate uses of the site will have an important bearing in their considerations of the proposed roadway design, which they will take up in the Definitive Plan review. GT noted his concerns include consideration of a second access point off of Parker Street, if the proposed uses of the site would warrant such an access.

BC asked if there were any waivers requested at this Preliminary Plan stage. ES noted that there are no waivers granted at a Preliminary Plan and they would be addressed at the Definitive Plan filing.

ES indicated that given the Board's concerns, he could add a sentence to Section IV(G)(2) of the Board's Decision, to read: "*Consideration of a second access should also be addressed as part of the Definitive Plan process.*" The Board concurred with this language.

KC inquired if approval of a Preliminary Plan would allow construction. ES indicated no, it just allows them to move into the Definitive Plan stage.

BC then asked if the Board members were now satisfied with the Draft Decision as modified this evening.

ML: One comment, which came up last time, there is a requirement for areas and dimensions for location of buildings in a general manner. ES indicated that is what we have been talking about, but as the Applicant has stated they don't know what the uses are at this time. ES noted therefore

he has tried to address this issue with the language in Section IV(G)(1) of the Preliminary Plan decision.

BC asked the Applicant and his Engineer if they add anything to add at this time. BT: A lot of these issues will be hashed out at the Definitive Plan stage. When we develop uses, we will have specifics we can measure impact on, like traffic.

BC noted there was no further discussion and called for the Board to move forward on a vote.

BC made a Motion to Approve the Preliminary Subdivision Plan for 129 Parker Street with the Findings and Comments contained in the Maynard Planning Board's Decision, as amended with the additional Finding and Comment. Seconded by GT. There was no further discussion. Vote 4 to 0 Approve. BC and ML signed Mullin Rule forms to allow them to vote on this decision.

Old/New Business

Update of 129 Parker Street and the 129 Parker Street Ad Hoc Working Group

BC indicated that he attended the last 129 Parker Street Ad Hoc Committee meeting, which was held last night, Monday, November 25th. BC also noted that ML had been in attendance for part of the meeting. BC indicated that last night's meeting was setting the groundwork for how the Committee's work will flow. He also noted that the Committee will be meeting weekly through Mid-February and requested that, if possible, other Planning Board members could hopefully attend from time to time.

BC noted that at the upcoming meetings Bob Depietri will be bringing forth alternative scenarios for discussion and comment. BC: There has been an interest of the public to get various uses into the site including, satellites for hospitals, research labs, etc. BC gave the example of Beth Israel Deaconess opening up at Wayland Commons and then inquired if there was anything we as a Town could do, to be a contact for the Town, to entice them (medical use) to come to Town.

BC asked the Town Planner to summarize other matters that came up at last night's meeting. ES noted that Angus Jennings provided his summary document of all the issues raised during the previous 129 Parker Street planning process up through the two community visioning sessions held in August and September. He noted that we plan to post that document on the website. ES noted that about 10-15 minutes were devoted to discuss opportunities and constraints associated with the 129 Parker property. ES mentioned that there discussions, which were identified by BC, to have residential uses abut Field Street. He also noted there were discussions related to connections to the High School from 129 Parker Street.

ES noted there was time devoted to discussions of considering a Chapter 40R zoning proposal for the site. The pros included the approximately \$1M in funding the Town would receive from the State if developed as a Chapter 40R, but the cons included it would require a longer approval process and Chapter 40R does not have a Concept Plan. BC indicated the 129 Parker Street Ad Hoc Committee was not in favor of proceeding with a Chapter 40R project at this time. The Board held

further discussions related to the concept of Chapter 40R and potentially applicability to other locations in Town.

It was noted the next meeting of the 129 Parker Street Ad Hoc Committee would be held on Wednesday, December 4th at 7:00p.m.

Lot Shape Zoning Requirements Discussion

GT indicated he had brought this forth given his concerns of the Fowler Street Extension Definitive Plan proposal with the rear lot lines of Lots 2, 3 and 4 and the shape of said lot line and asked the Board to consider developing a Lot Shape/Lot Regularity Zoning Requirement. He noted it was a long-term project. BC noted he did not raise tonight, as he has some other zoning bylaws, including cluster zoning, he hopes to bring forth for development.

ES indicated his research so far has shown that towns across Massachusetts have taken different approaches to address preventing irregular lot shapes. He indicated he was hoping to continue this work and finish it and then present at a meeting when it is ready. Then the Board could have a discussion on the different options and provide their input accordingly.

Correspondence

DLTA:

BC read information received from the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) regarding request for proposals to MAPC under the District Local Technical Assistance (DLTA) program. ES indicated he is very familiar with the DLTA program, as he did work under that program through his previous employer. ES noted that the DLTA program, which has been around for about 5 years, provides planning assistance to communities and so far Maynard has not applied to MAPC for any such assistance. ES also noted that the Planning Board has expressed interested recently about development of two new zoning bylaws: a) Conservation/Open Space Subdivision Design and b) Inclusionary Housing. ES noted with his time commitments on the 129 Parker Street Ad Hoc Committee and other existing commitments; he recommended that the Planning Board consider applying for DLTA assistance through MAPC for these two bylaws, as they appear to be eligible. The deadline to apply is Friday, December 13th and it requires submission by the Chief Elected Officer. ES indicated he hoped that could be the Town Administrator given the deadline to apply is in about two weeks.

ES noted that housing is a priority of the State at this time, so he anticipated a good chance to receive the assistance from MAPC to develop the Inclusionary Housing Bylaw. The Board indicated their support to the Town Planner to submit DLTA applications to MAPC on their behalf for the two bylaws noted above. ML suggested the Town Planner contact the Housing Authority Director for his input in the need for affordable housing and comments on development of the Inclusionary Housing Bylaw. The Board held other discussions related to affordable housing, particularly related to assurance that all eligible affordable housing units are indeed on the Town's 40B Inventory.

213 Main Street Special Permit Decision Appeal:

ES indicated that he received documentation related to the 213 Main Street Special Permit decision appeal indicating that Town Counsel made an appearance at the Land Court on behalf of the Planning Board. The Board requested status of the appeal at the Land Court. ES indicated the documentation provides no specifics but he would ask the Town Administrator to have Town Counsel provide him with an update so he could report back to the Board accordingly.

WAVM:

ES indicated that the Planning Board recently received a letter from WAVM, Maynard's High School-Student-run radio station, requesting community members to have a radio show that provides community information. This request is part of the radio station seeking an approval for their FCC license extension. ES noted that he did sign up for a 30-minute monthly show and will provide updates on planning related matters during that radio show.

Other:

GT indicated an interest of his is to determine if there any limits or barriers, including zoning, to mixed use development, specifically residential above commercial in the Downtown. JK noted that mixed-use was encouraged under the DOD (Downtown Overlay District). Further discussion ensued related to requirements versus incentives of residential above commercial in Downtown, including examples of two buildings permitted under the DOD: the Walgreens building in Downtown (which does not have apartments above it) and Jimmy MacDonald's planned building at 16-20 Main Street (which will have apartments above the building when completed).

KC requested an update on the Assabet River Rail Trail project. ES indicated that the Town Administrator has assigned this Project back to the Conservation Agent, Linda Hansen, who was coordinating it prior to my hiring. ES indicated he asked Linda Hansen this morning to brief him about the status of this Project. They have hired the firm of Greenman-Pedersen, Inc. (GPI) to take over from AECOM to do the design work moving forward. GPI is doing all the wetland flagging at this time for the ANRAD hearing, which will be at the Conservation Commission's meeting next Tuesday. GPI will also be doing more survey work along the ARRT corridor. Once they have the new survey work and the ANRAD complete, they plan to do the more detailed design that is required, including looking at the various intersections that have were identified as concerns. ES indicated he would let the Board know when additional meetings are scheduled for this Project.

The Board discussed the status of the opportunity of the Planning Board to provide comments related to the 25% Design plans that were presented in June.

ML Made a Motion to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by KC. Vote 4 to 0 to adjourn the meeting.

Prepared by Eric R. Smith, AICP, Town Planner

List of Documents Entered into the Records
On file at the Office of Municipal Services

1. November 25, 2013 Letter from Wayne Amico, VHB, Review of Fowler Street Extension Definitive Subdivision Proposed street extension and five-lot subdivision.
2. November 26, 2013 Letter from Mark T. Donohoe, Acton Survey & Engineering, Inc. re: Fowler Street Extension Definitive Subdivision Decision Deadline Extension to December 17, 2013.
3. August 24, 2010 Planning Board Meeting Minutes related to the McDonald's Temporary Exit onto Main Street.
4. 129 Parker Street Preliminary Plan Draft Decision