



**BILLERICA PLANNING BOARD**  
Town Hall  
365 Boston Road Billerica, MA 01821  
978-671-0962  
978-670-9448 Fax

RECEIVED

2023 SEP 14 P 3 21

Blake Robertson, *Chair*

Edward Giroux, *Vice Chair*  
Christopher Tribou  
Kelley Sardina

Marlies Henderson, *Secretary*  
Michael Parker  
Evens Cimea

**Planning Board Meeting  
Minutes**

June 12, 2023 @ 7:00 P.M.  
Hybrid

Videod by BATV

Can be Viewed: <https://billerica.cablecast.tv/CablecastPublicSite/?channel=3>

Members	Present
Blake Robertson, Chair	X
Ed Giroux, Vice-Chair	X
Marlies Henderson, Secretary	X
Michael Parker	X
Chris Tribou	X
Kelley Sardina	X
Evens Cimea	X

**Staff**

Erika Oliver Jerram-Director of Planning & Community Development  
Katherine Malgieri-Senior Planner

---

**Open Mic**

None

---

**Agenda Item 1:**

**REAPPOINTMENTS**

Housing Partnership (existing: Michael Parker)

Street Acceptances Committee (existing: Edward Giroux)

Marlies Henderson asked if the Housing Partnership Committee was necessary, as it has not met in several years. Mike Rosa, Select Board, was in the audience and offered comments.

Acknowledged by the Chair, Rosa stated that the Select Board considered and chose not to disband the Housing Partnership Committee because it should be in place in the event that the Town falls below the 10% affordability housing stock requirement. The Housing Partnership Committee is the first stop for any 40B application prior to Zoning Board review, and as such Rosa recommends keeping the committee appointments up to date.

Henderson asked Chair if she needed to make nomination, or if everything would stay the same to which Robertson stated no, he would take care it.

No action taken.

Agenda Item 2:

**ANR (Approval Not Required) Cartwright Lane and 7 John F Allan Drive, Parcels 79-272-3-10-1 and 79-255-2**

The applicant proposes to adjust the existing side lot line between the two properties in the Neighborhood Residence Zoning District.

Steve Lentine, agent for owner, presented the proposal. The lot line adjustment will allow the existing nonconforming lot at the corner to conform to current buildable standards.

Board had no concerns. Ed Giroux moved to endorse. Marlies Henderson seconded. All in favor. Plan endorsed.

---

Agenda Item 5:

(Chair called on Agenda Item 5 to be heard next).

**MIXED USE OVERLAY**

Discussion led by Chair.

Robertson stated previous meetings had raised a concern about the Mixed Use Overlay Zone regulations (Section 5.E.11 of the Town Zoning Bylaws. Robertson assigned the concerns to three 'buckets':

- Omissions (zoning items that are not currently in MU Overlay standards that are proposed to be added like green strips and visitor parking requirements),
- Remediation (zoning items currently in MU Overlay that are proposed to be altered like height and density maximums.)
- Clarification (whether present or not currently like expanding definitions within the MU Overlay section, altering how wetlands are treated, rewording affordability requirement, and making more items compulsory).

Robertson identified that because the proposed remediation items include lowering housing density, it would require a supermajority at Town Meeting. Public comment was also requested.

Michael Rosa was present in the audience and provided multiple recommendations regarding the Mixed Use Overlay Zone bylaw, following the three categories as described above.

Rosa's summary request for consideration was for the Board to specifically change the following within the Mixed Use Overlay Zone:

-Make sure affordability is required in perpetuity

- Do not allow affordability buyouts
- Increase setbacks and parking minimums
- Do not allow offsite parking leases
- Remove “minor amendments” tool
- Consider him to participate on a subcommittee

Chair called for Board discussion, prompting whether the Town “deserves” to look at this and if so, should it be by the whole Planning Board or by a subcommittee.

Kelley Sardina stated her preference for the whole Board to work on it. She asked for heavy public engagement with comprehensive review, rather than trying to “tweak” it.

Chris Tribou stated he had no issue with looking at amending it, but believed the focus should be on issues that were already raised within Zoning Audit, rather than on tweaking polarizing topics further. He expressed concern of moving forward with drastic changes that would fail at Town Meeting anyway, but would support a narrowed focus based on the findings of the Zoning Audit.

Ed Giroux stated concern that the words “mixed use” seem to evoke fear of high-rise densities, but described it as what already exists in Town such as at the Center with apartments above Liberty Bell and Taylor Florist. He stated if changes are made to the bylaw, they should be more organized than the presented list. And with Recodification and MBTA Communities occurring in parallel, thought this third outreach item should wait.

Evens Cimea stated he would like the whole Board to be involved, rather than subcommittee.

Michael Parker stated he agreed with many of the listed line items that Rosa suggests but does not want to rush it while Board is simultaneously working on recodification, MBTA Communities, and also Rules and Regulations review. He would prefer to bring it to the Town Meeting which follows recodification approval.

Marlies Henderson stated the Board had reached consensus at the March 8<sup>th</sup> meeting when Rosa first presented his suggested amendments as a potential warrant article. At that time, the Board did not recommend the warrant article due to priority of recodification of the Zoning Bylaw prior to taking on Policy Issues. She also disagreed with the opinion that the current Bylaw needed revision.

Robertson called on Staff to weigh in. Erika Oliver Jerram stated that zoning changes should be made intentionally, and that the Zoning Audit can be used to clean up the document so that we can then talk about policy concerns. Public outreach commitments for the Recodification process and the MBTA Communities law take time and effort.

Robertson stated that while some do not prioritize the revisions or think them necessary, he does so he will take it upon himself to put it on the agenda.

Sardina suggested continuing to discuss the topic, while not aiming for an urgent Fall 2023 or Spring 2024 warrant article. It should be looked at as a whole, by the whole Board.

Robertson responded that he feels urgency due to “one particular parcel in particular which will not be named” could request rezoning and the ramifications would be unknown. He believes Staff and the Board would continue to push back on such petitioner-based rezoning until after Recodification.

Rosa requested to speak again, and Robertson allowed.

Rosa restated his concerns was recapped what he felt was urgent deficiencies:

- Definitions should include terms like 'shall', 'story', and 'height'
- Affordable Units requirement should state "in perpetuity"
- Design Guidelines should require minimum green strips and setbacks
- Parking requirements should not allow offsite leasing
- Required submission documents should require water capacity studies, similar to sewer
- Signage does not reference sign code section
- Waiver procedures are not clarified

Parker made a motion for the Planning Board to take up the Mixed Use Overlay Bylaw for corrections, for an end-date to be determined.

Seconded by Cimea.

The motion passed 4-3, with Tribou, Giroux, and Henderson dissenting.

---

### Agenda Item 3:

#### **MBTA COMMUNITIES (MGL 40a, 3a) Introduction and Kickoff**

NMCOG will present to the Board the compliance required by the State and will overview the action items ahead.

Kelly Lynema and Michael Asciola, of Northern Middlesex Council of Governments (NMCOG) presented an introduction to the MBTA Communities law and its standards for Billerica, to kick off the planning process.

Lynema identified the meeting is preliminary, and there is no voting or designing or drafting of new zoning on the table yet. Their presentation has pause points for discussion with Board members on how to move forward over the next several months.

Asciola identified their agenda has questions for the Board; an overview of requirements as stated in the EOHLC guidelines; discussion of zoning goals, qualities, and considerations; review of potential locations and next steps and project schedule.

#### *1. Questions of the Board:*

What are your top considerations for selecting district location(s)? What are the qualities that lead you to select these locations for increased housing density?

Are there any locations where you have immediate agreement for locating the district(s)?

Are there any areas that should NOT be considered? If so, where and why?

Sales pitch: the Planning Board will present the final proposal to Town Meeting - in thinking about eventual district locations, why should multifamily housing go there?

Understanding objections and concerns: what kind of opposition might you expect from other residents or neighbors for these locations? What questions and concerns do you have that we can look into or address before our next meeting?

(No discussion yet. Questions identified to be in the Boardmembers mind as they move forward).

#### *2. Overview of Requirements:*

TIMELINE

The Executive Office of Housing and Livable Communities (EOHLC) required Action Plan submission by January 31, 2023 and Billerica is compliant. Throughout 2023 and into 2024, public engagement and planning process will occur. EOHLC will require at least 90 days to review draft zoning PRIOR TO filing warrant article for Town Meeting. EOHLC will require approval of compliant zoning no later than December 31, 2024. Project schedule is based on Spring Town Meeting 2024. Recorded webinar is available from EOHLC to further understand requirements, guidelines, and next steps at [www.mass.gov/mbtacomunities](http://www.mass.gov/mbtacomunities). Billerica's actions are being posted at [www.town.billerica.ma.us/mbtacomunities](http://www.town.billerica.ma.us/mbtacomunities).

## COMPLIANCE

As a Commuter Rail community, the MBTA Communities requirements for Billerica include a zoned capacity of at least 2,323 units. (not required to be built. . . but land area within zoning district at the designated density allowances must have the ability for that many units. Because land underneath the new zoning is likely already developed, there is no required redevelopment). A minimum of 50 acres of land area for the district. At least 40% of the district must be within the station area. At least 50% of the district must be in one contiguous area.

Compliance with State Law is an important goal, but Town has also identified housing needs locally, according to Billerica Master Plan and Housing Production Plan. Town would like to see more housing choices and workforce housing (Teachers, Fire, Police Officers, empty nesters looking to downsize, adult children looking to move home, etc). Existing housing in Billerica is over 70% singlefamily homes and 15% multifamily at 10+ units. Small percentages are low-density multifamily, twinhomes, townhomes, 4-plexes, etc. This "missing middle" could help Town's housing goals.

### 3. *Discussion of Zoning Goals, Qualities and Considerations*

NMCOG created goals based on Billerica's Action Plan, Master Plan, Housing Production Plan, prior public comments, and MBTA Communities requirements.

#### Expand options for complete neighborhoods

-locating near bus stops and public transportation, where residents can access most services/activities within 15 minutes (strong, connected communities; Traffic reduction)

#### Support and strengthen small commercial areas

-locating near existing commercial areas (economic success for businesses; Traffic reduction)

#### Increase access to goods and services via nonvehicular means

-promoting walkability, providing sidewalks, trails, bike lanes; locating near retail, services, parks, etc. (Traffic reduction, healthier community)

#### Increase housing along transit corridors

-providing access to transit for farther destinations by locating near commuter station and bus lines

NMCOG asked Board if these goals are reflective? Did they miss anything?

Robertson: What is the difference between “complete neighborhood” and “complete street”?

A: Complete neighborhood is where regular business amenities are near your residence so you can run out and get what you need quickly without having to drive across town.

Sardina: (Going back to requirements section) Do we have a 40R district?

A: The town does not have a district. The 40R is not the same as the MBTA Communities, although the standards of 40R do overlap with 40R requirements. So a 40R district could be required if it met the MBTA Communities requirements also.

Robertson: (Going back to requirements section) So what does the law require? Can the Board look at a half-mile map? Perhaps it's not prudent to talk about goals yet?

Tribou: If 40% has to be near the train station, and another 50% has to be contiguous, the Mill area is a good location and has some walkability; but Billerica townwide has a sidewalk infrastructure issue which favors cars more than people. He isn't sure where else the zoning can go.

A: The Town has choices. Any 50% needs to be contiguous to itself, and could even overlap the 40% at the train station. So NMCOG's question is how much the Planning Board prioritizes commercial access to the new district in order to move on to next topic of potential locations.

Sardina: Could not answer questions without having time to preview slides.

A: The only question is discussion and buy-in of the goals mentioned. That is the framework for other questions moving forward.

Henderson: Suggested additional goal to protect large open spaces from development. Suggested Mills as priority location choice with a lot of density available. Expressed concern of Cider Mill property which could instead be wet and open space.

Tribou: Supports walkability and non-vehicular goals. What design standards can the zoning require to help pedestrian-friendly amenities?

A: Sidewalks, perhaps bus stops (but that is a conversation through LRTA). The Use of apartments is not deniable, but typical Site Plan review and design standards is allowable.

Giroux: Our community is already sprawled with assorted shopping centers. How can the town achieve nonvehicular access and walkability?

A: These goals are not for the whole town, but just the new zoning district area. So choosing a district location near such plazas would help, followed by design standards to encourage the walkability to there.

Giroux: The Mills make sense, but there is not a lot of retail there at the moment.

Cimea: Would like to ensure active recreational areas such as playgrounds are available, not just passive open space. Also, how will the environmental impact of new developments be reviewed?

A: Any redevelopment is still subject to all traditional permits and review standards for the new siting.

Henderson: Added that re-use of existing buildings, such as the large mills, would lessen the potential impacts.

Parker: Identified that transit has limited corridors and routes. So the Town needs to place the district where destinations already exist, because they do not have control to place a new grocery store somewhere, or to add a bus route somewhere.

Looking at the “missing middle”, he supports building the duplexes and other smaller density options, rather than the 10+ unit developments.

Expressed concern of electrical, water, and sewer capacity for increased housing capacity.

Expressed desire for green engineering design standards (townwide, not just MBTA-based zoning).

Robertson: Identified that goals can conflict with each other. The Mills seem to be an ideal location for its capacity and proximity to transit, but there has poor proximity to commercial. Concerned of adding the district to other transit locations, specifically Cider Mill.

A: NMCOG confirmed that is the conversation to be had. How to balance the goals and select the locations.

Sardina: Supports that goals are to mitigate impact by reducing vehicular traffic. Concerned of utility capacity also and that no location is perfect.

A: Robertson deferred to the Town’s requirement to comply.

Rosa requested to speak again, and Robertson allowed, pertaining to the Goals only as the Presentation was not yet complete.

Rosa agreed it would be nice to reduce traffic, although no zoning would be a magic fix. He described how redevelopment of a single-family home within a district might look once density is allowed, and inquired whether rental vs ownership is stipulated.

A: (No stipulation).

Rosa identified that market rate units will be based on market. There is no expectation for the listing price to be lower than current values. He also identified that housing shortage will only make rates go higher and would not cater to recent college graduates or low-income residents. What are the allowable requirements for affordable housing in this district?

A: Up to 10% of units can be required to be reserved for low-income residents. Any higher percentage would require an economic impact feasibility.

#### 4. *Review of Potential Locations*

NMCOG presentation continued to illustrate an acre (about a football field) and different density types (15 units would look like five triple-deckers). Visual examples provided:

-Linden Square, 11 Oak Street, in Wellesley MA has townhouse development at 12 units per acre. (minimal visual impact, close to 15/acre density requirement. Would take more acres than the 50acre minimum to reach full capacity of units)

-Harborside Village, 91 Front Street, in Scituate, MA has 3-story apartment building at 30 units per acre (similar to Mills in scale. Higher density would allow smaller total acres to be rezoned)

-Brookside Square, 70 Beharrell Street, in Concord MA has 3-story apartment building at 17 units per acre (typical development style)

-30 Haven, at 30 Haven Street in Reading, MA has a 4-story apartment complex with 53 units on less than 1 acre of land (=68 units per acre). Also illustrates that the new zoning district could allow and encourage new commercial uses.

Requirements: capacity minimum of 2,323 units. Accomplished within a spectrum of two minimums: Size minimum of 50 acres. Density minimum of 15units/acre.

To put zoning on the minimum land size of 50 acres, the density per acre would need to be higher. To put zoning with the minimum allowable density per acre, the land size of the district would need to be larger. NMCOG paused for Board feedback of this spectrum.

Henderson: The Mills, again, sound like a great location and would have a lot of density to keep the land size area down.

Tribou: How will this zoning coexist with Historic District regulations?

A: Historic District regulations might not allow any type of new building or addition by right, but re-use of existing buildings, such as mills or conversion of single-family homes into multiple homes, could be done.

Tribou: So would putting this zoning within historic districts count for compliance?

A: As long as the standards aren't considered overburdened, yes. They can get back with more nuance.

NMCOG showed Potential District Locations map (See slide 23), based on Housing Production Plan areas for proposed housing locations, which is scattered throughout town and not in line with transit or commercial areas. Multifamily and Mixed Use zones are also identified, which currently total about 300 acres, which is twice as much as what the new district would need to be at the lower density levels.

The areas will need to be connected in a larger district to meet EOHLC criteria. At least 40% of the new zoning area(s) need to be within ½ mile of the train station. NMCOG will look at a scenario of what putting all of the new zoning there would look like. Other options could include extending it towards the Mixed Use Overlay "B" area, or within Town Center. (See Slide 24).

##### 5. *Next Steps and Project Schedule*

NMCOG provided questions to the Board earlier to think about for discussion of locations:

1. What are your top considerations for selecting district location(s)? What are the qualities that lead you to select these locations for increased housing density?
2. Are there any locations where you have immediate agreement for locating the district(s)?
3. Are there any areas that should NOT be considered? If so, where and why?
4. Sales pitch: the Planning Board will present the final proposal to Town Meeting – in thinking about eventual district locations, why should multifamily housing go there?
5. Understanding objections and concerns: what kind of opposition might you expect from other residents or neighbors for these locations? What questions and concerns do you have that we can look into or address before our next meeting?

Sardina asked about the mapping, which illustrated existing zones. Specifically, concerned of the Mall which she recalls having locked zoning and housing and would not be eligible for additional housing.

A: These regions are not precise to specific properties.

Tribou asked for additional board opinions on whether they like higher concentration at the Mills or looking for lower density spread out.

A: Robertson identified this as the primary question and deferred it to the July meeting.

A: NMCOG offered to prepare some scenarios to illustrate at a later date.



- A: Parker stated no decisions on locations should be made without feedback from the neighborhoods/communities impacted.
- A: Jerram identified public outreach on location planning will be achieved by monthly Planning Board meetings. Staff will also post satellite office hours (“Ask a Planner”) to be more accessible for technical questions. Additional communications plan is being developed through CHAPA (we have been awarded technical assistance grant) to ensure we are reaching other corners of public opinion.

Giroux summarized the primary takeaway from the June meeting is that the Board prioritizes redevelopment over new development in its location selection.

#### Agenda Item 4:

##### TOWN CENTER REDESIGN

Discussion led by Town Manager’s Office.

John Curran, Town Manager, presented to the Planning Board the proposed redesign of the Town Center. He summarized that he is going to various boards and stakeholders for overview and input, such as adjacent business owners and the Historic Districts Commission.

##### *How did we get here?*

Project is coming forward again after Select Board re-initiated the project due to Mass Downtown Initiative Grant, engaging StanTech as the engineer, in 2019. That initiative was halted due to pandemic, and is being picked back up with additional tweaks for current standards and past feedback.

##### *Why are we doing this project?*

Project will connect the state improvement projects along Boston Road to the north and south of the center (will connect the gap). As well as improve curb appeal, walkability/bikeability, and improve intersection operations.

##### *Proposed Improvements*

Project will simplify traffic circulation, reduce number of signals, and provide signalized protected crosswalks.

##### *Parking*

Most public concerns heard have been about parking. The proposal will alter the 33 existing onstreet spaces and provide 54 spaces:

Boston Road (northbound) has 19 existing street spaces and the proposal offers 27 (17 onstreet with new 10-space offstreet parking area).

Blanchard Road, between library and COA, has 14 existing spaces and the proposal offers 11 total.

Concord Road, abutting the Common, has no existing parking and the proposal offers 16 angled parking spaces. (Alternatively, 10 parallel spaces as illustrated to HDC).

##### *Tree Impacts and Planting*

The plan calls for removal of 24 total trees (11 invasive, 6 weak, and 7 otherwise healthy trees due to location). 26 trees will be planted.

### *Historic Elements*

Several historic artifacts are located at the Center, and some will require shifting/relocating.

### *Proposed Preliminary Plan*

Overview of impact to different intersections and directions of travel:

River Street, entering Boston Road: The island will be removed for straighter vehicle traffic, and new green space with the relocated historic markers will buffer the Marshall House from the roadway. Traffic on River Street will be signalized, and able to turn left or right onto Boston Road, and will have ability to turn onto Andover Road as well.

Boston Road will be 2 lanes traveling north, and 2 lanes travelling south, with dedicated turn lanes at the Andover/River St intersection and at the Cummings/OConnors Plaza intersection. Maximum achievable vehicle speed due to the signals will be 20mph. This paired with parallel parking should keep traffic flowing smoothly and slowly.

Rotary traffic that exists currently going southbound and turning Left (northbound) onto Boston Road will no longer exist. Concord Road, ie, Cummings Street is only car counts in that direction.

Blanchard Street will be two-way still, and the connection between Blanchard Road and Concord Road/Cummings Street will also be two-way, to allow quick exit to those residents and patrons regardless of their direction of travel.

### *Bicycle Accommodation Plan*

Bike connectivity is accessible from MassDOT projects to the north and south of the center. Connecting this gap will also provide connections to Yankee Doodle Bike Path through Good Street, River Street, and Concord Road.

### *Renderings*

Presentation included renderings to better visualize proposal, including width of sidewalks and shared use paths, differing materials for crosswalks, and how outdoor dining would fit in.

Curran asked for feedback.

Sardina liked that the change would put less cars going around the rotary because the Town has very few main roads, so most people use this intersection regardless of their path. She asked if traffic counts were done.

A: Traffic Survey was based on existing 2022 conditions and 2032 estimates. One big difference between existing volume and proposed times is the proposed addition of crosswalk controls (which will delay vehicles further). South: 1m5s existing. 56seconds proposed without crosswalks. 1m 0s with crosswalks. Average: travel times reduced by 15s. Some traffic directions are more valuable than others (such as southbound Boston to Andover Road or River Street to northbound Boston Road).

Sardina wants to see flow, not stop and go.

A: Current speeds average 12mph to 20mph. The proposal would smooth this range to 13mph-18mph.

Tribou: Likes the walkways and historic consideration. Concerned about width of pavement across Boston Road in terms of pedestrian safety. Also did not like the additional parking abutting the Common, (other than a few for ADA access to the common). By sacrificing those parking spaces, it would prioritize pedestrian use of the access road and the Common.

A: Crosswalks will be signalized and better than before. The road is already that wide, but all one way. As for Common parking, the SelectBoard will have final decision of those parking spaces. Most people seem to prefer them being there.

Giroux: Supports the pedestrian and bike spaces. Supports opening River St and Andover Roads to more direct traffic flow, rather than rotary around the common. Asked if parking pad at OConnors Parking would be open to public, not just patrons. Asked if crosswalks would be raised.

A: The parking is proposed as a public parking easement, and yes the crosswalks will be raised.

Cimea: Appreciates the increased safety around the Common.

Parker: Likes the replacement tree plantings. Asked if renderings were accurate to the plan (background landscaping east of Boston Road looks heavily treed, but not shown in official plan). Also concerned of Boston Road businesses with loading vehicles. Pedestrian safety looks good. Wants to verify that OConnor's loss of green space at their driveway island will not make them deficient in required open space.

A: No, rendering is not accurate, but they can look to plant more there. Discussions with businesses are ongoing. And they will look into OConnor's open space.

Henderson: would like dedicated bike lane on the pavement, separated from vehicles and from pedestrians, acknowledging that the loss of a vehicular lane would be needed. She is concerned that building for smoother vehicle traffic will induce more vehicular traffic. She also does not see bus stops. Also suggested municipal traffic should look for other routes that do not go through the center to further reduce vehicular demand on the center. Appreciates the raised crosswalks, and they're gradual for snowplows? And will the old crosswalk lighting be reutilized somewhere else (it was expensive)?

A: The Town has previously looked for other routes, but would require impact to neighborhood roads, to include taking of property for road widening and sidewalks on the back roads. The local need/focus for vehicle traffic would not support the suggestion for separated bike lanes. Yes, the raised crosswalks will allow snowplows to navigate and yes, the old crosswalk signal which will be getting removed could be re-installed somewhere else more appropriate.

Robertson: Concerned about parallel parking along Boston Road, south of Andover, which could block visibility and maneuverability for right turns onto Andover Road. He does not see a solution without cutting more into Town Common, which he thinks is getting decreased.

A: They can look to bump out the curbing. And the size of the Common is increasing with this proposal, not decreasing. Parallel parking is illustrated to have buffer area between it and travel lane.

Robertson: Concerned about historic Minuteman March route. History says they rallied at the common, and marched down Concord Road. The bump-out of Concord Road will turn green what

was previously paved, and he would like to know when the Town will submit the permit or application to the State Historical Preservation Office for them to decide whether or not this plan adequately preserves this vital part of the Town's history.

A: The site is commemorated and marked on the plan. They will check at the State level regarding the March route itself and the adjustment of roadway pavings.

Chair called for public comment. None.

Agenda Item 5:

**RELEASE OF CONDITIONS**

Woodside Manor Estates (Good St, Lasalette Rd, Corcoran Rd, Crowley Rd)

Requested by agent for 18 Corcoran Rd

Robertson identified the request is for cleanup of a 50+-year old subdivision.

Henderson asked about a paper street connecting Good Street and Lasellette and if creating an official path is related to the subdivision release.

A: It is separate.

Henderson made a motion to release the conditions for Woodside Manor Estates. Michael Parker seconded.

Robertson clarified the motion will carry the entire subdivision, not just requested parcel, and called the vote. All in favor.

Other Business:

**Approval of Minutes: May 8, 2023**

Giroux moved. Parker seconded. No comments. All in favor.

**Committee Updates**

None

**Staff Updates**

RFPs being drafted for Open Space and Recreation Plan, and for Zoning Recodification.

Staff currently in temporary office (1<sup>st</sup> floor behind auditorium. Signs are posted).

Farmer's Market starts next Monday, June 19<sup>th</sup>.

Neighborhood meetings this week, assorted days and locations.

Robertson reported inquiries he received:

1. marijuana production facility that is seeking to come to Billerica
2. Rose Manor should have connection to 480 Boston Road according to plan conditions

Parker reported inquiry he received:

1. Concern of mall parking spaces and the width. Jerram described that Building Commissioner has visited site and found them compliant. (spaces should be measured center of stripe to center of stripe).

Adjournment

Henderson moved to adjourn. Giroux seconded. All in favor. Adjourned 10:26pm.