

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
THURSDAY DECEMBER 6, 2018 AT 6:30 PM  
SHATTUCK STREET TOWN OFFICES  
37 SHATTUCK STREET ROOM 103**

**Members Present:** Mark Montanari, Chair; Ed Mullen, Vice Chair; Anna Hueston, Clerk;  
Jamie Cruz, Member; Peter Scott, Member  
Also Present: Maren Toohill, Town Planner, Judi Barret

1. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

2. **ANR – Newtown Road – between #410 and #414 Newtown Road:** Ms. Toohill noted this is the former Yapp property 414 Newtown road, which ended up in the town's hands. Two of the abutters are looking to purchase two parcels of the land. Other parcels will go to conservation. Needs to be decided by end of year. The Board reviewed the ANR Plan as presented. Mr. Montanari had no issues, Mr. Mullen made a motion to accept, and Ms. Cruz seconded it. Mr. Scott noted that his son owns an adjacent property. The Board voted all in favor, 4:0 (Scott abstained). The Board members endorsed the ANR plan.

3. **Preliminary Subdivision – 195 Tahattawan Road –** Mr. Bruce Ringwall of GPR presented the proposed development of Healey Corner. The property is approximately 43 acres, and has a homestead on it. Preliminary plan was submitted prior to Fall Town Meeting and proposed Board of Health Regulations to grandfather the development rights for the property. Conventional layout; the plan contains 2 concepts. The first 5 lots make up the field, additional lots extend to the back; it's a deep property; 17 lots are shown on the conventional layout. The wetlands have been delineated and a Notice of Resource Area Delineation (NRAD) will be filed soon with the Conservation Commission. The chart on the plan indicates all the lots, acreage, access strips, the lot areas, the lot perimeter, the coefficient of each lot, and shows they all have adequate frontage. Open Space Parcels A, B, and C would be combined with abutting Town property. Regulations require that when submitting a subdivision development, it be submitted under the open space program. The Open Space concept preliminary plan for an open space development, removes the 3 lots in the northeast, further on the left hand. Per bylaw and regulations, when eliminating frontage lots to protect the area along the road to keep it in the natural state, you are able to add them into the open space and that has been done. Moved the 3 lots into the open space area and reduced the number of lots, with 17 lots total proposed in the Open Space layout. Both plans would use a series of shared driveways. The driveway would come into the 4 lots in the center of the property, as shared driveway, then branch off into 2 regular driveways into the other units. This development scenario uses approximately 13 acres of land for the development and establish approximately 26 acres of land that would be open space. Both concepts have drainage areas shown in a rough manner. The bend in the road is a low spot where all the necks come off, and the drainage would come

to the center of either one, collect and come off into a drainage area in the back of the two lots on either side of all those necks, and discharge into the wet lands. The drainage in the back in the other cluster of 4, would collect and discharge into the area around them as well.

Mr. Scott commented it looks fine. Mr. Mullen asked how much of the open space is wetlands; Mr. Ringwall estimated about 40% wetlands, but he would calculate that. Mr. Montanari asked about perc testing. Mr. Ringwall noted that deep hole and perc tests were done, with testing on the 3 lots along Tahattawan Road removed from the Open Space layout, those were still to be completed. He outlined the perc test results. Mr. Montanari noted that he had concerns with the bonus density. Ms. Hueston noted that additional comments had come in. Ms. Cruz asked about abutting conservation property. Don MacIver noted that there are 8 large Town parcels and Mary Brown-private property- adjacent, plus several hundreds of acres. Mr. MacIver outlined concerns with the clustering of the development, creating a wall between the open space properties. He stated that the open space plan would be great if the 4 lots to the rear of the property were removed; you don't want to fragment the open space.

Mr. Montanari expressed the need to follow up once we have more information from conservation. Rick Findlay of the Littleton Conservation Trust noted that a trail system from the Long Lake area to the commuter rail station could link through this site. Mr. Mullen noted that BPAC would also support a bike path. A discussion regarding the timeline for a decision on a Preliminary plan followed; the discussion was continued to the Jan. 10, 2019 meeting. Mr. Montanari asked Ms. Toohill to arrange a site walk with developer, open to conservation trust and representation from the committees between now and 1/10. Mr. Scott asked if is this something the Glavey's are interested in pursuing in an aggressive fashion. Mr. Ringwall responded that is not being pursued very aggressively, but the Glavey's need to protect their rights. Mr. Scott asked if there are chances of extending the project. Mr. Ringwall responded that the Glavey's would be very interested in doing that, but he needs to check if there is a legal format to do so. The Board agreed to check with Town Counsel whether there is a legal framework to do that.

The meeting was adjourned for a Public Hearing.

#### **4. Continued Public Hearing – The Point/Constitution Avenue – Modify Sign Standards –**

Mr. Sam Park, applicant outlined the request to resolve the issue of the sign window coverage, at 50%. After much discussion, the Board came to the decision that this application and proposed revision would memorialize the proposal, allowing signs with 50% window coverage. Mr. Park noted that Party City murals were a concern to the Board, if it is viewed as a sign. Mr. Park noted that the tower near the Emerson Hospital facility was in violation of the sign criteria; we should sit with the Building Department to see where the disagreements are. He noted that the idea would be to amend the package if needed for Market Basket and Party City. With open air centers, the big issue has been with the signage.

Ms. Cruz asked about the 50% window coverage. Mr. Park stated that the 50% coverage should be in the proposed description. A discussion of the Party City window coverings followed. Ms. Hueston asked about memorializing the decision and enforcement process. Mr. Montanari noted that enforcement was through the Building Department. Mr. Scott referred to the proposed detailed sign standards.

Mr. Mullen motioned to approve the sign standards as drafted and also made a motion that anything exceeding 50% window area must come before the board for minor sign modification. Mr. Scott seconded the motion. The Board approved, all in favor 5:0. Mr. Park indicated on a side note, that if anyone would like to see building L under construction, he would give the Planning Board a tour. Mr. Montanari asked if the skating rink would get started this year. Mr. Park said he is hoping to re-introduce it next year.

**5. Public Hearing – “Jones Meadow” Spectacle Pond Road at Cricket Lane – Senior Residential Development Special Permit, Aquifer and Water Resource District Special Permit.** Mr. Montanari noted that the Public Hearing for the Jones Meadow special permits would be continued. Ms. Toohill mentioned that she anticipates the Definitive Subdivision application will be submitted and the Public Hearing opening as soon as the January 10<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**6. Continued Public Hearing – 245 Foster Street – Aquifer and Water Resource District Special Permit and Site Plan – Commuter Parking and Preliminary Subdivision**

The applicant’s authorization from property owner to pursue special permit approvals on the site was withdrawn by the property owner. Mr. Montanari asked if the applicant has asked to withdraw without prejudice. Ms. Toohill responded; Yes, verbally. Mr. Montanari asked if we should to give him is fee back. Ms. Toohill recommend that since we have not taken any of the board’s time on reviewing the subdivision, that it be allowed to withdraw as is. Mr. Scott made a motion to refund the Preliminary Subdivision application fee. Mr. Mullen seconded. Ms. Toohill indicated that if an application is withdrawn without activity, it is typical for the board to return the fee. Mr. Mullen motioned to accept the withdrawal without prejudice, provided we receive a written withdrawal request, and refund the Preliminary Subdivision application fee. Mr. Scott seconded. All in favor 5:0.

**7. Continued Public Hearing- 97 Mill Road – Aquifer and Water Resource District Special Permit and Site Plan Review for redevelopment of Parlee Lumber Site (Warren’s Mill)**

Mrs. Toohill noted that the peer review for the 97 Mill Road site had not started yet; it would cover Planning Board, Conservation Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals. It requires zoning board of appeals because they are proposing fill within the flood plain. Attempting to do one peer review instead of three. The applicant had requested the Public Hearings be continued. Mr. Scott made a motion to continue the Public Hearing to Jan. 10. Mr. Mullen seconded this motion and the Board voted 5:0.

**Board Business:** Mr. Scott asked about the status of Whitetail Way. The project has been ongoing for 20 years without a second means of egress. A discussion followed, with a meeting to be scheduled with the developer as soon as possible.

**7. Continued Public Hearing – 93 Foster Street Definitive Open Space Subdivision – new name: “The Homes at Croft Common”**

Engineer Dan Carr of Stamski & McNary was present and provided an overview of the plan revisions based on the peer review. Some changes have been made:

- \* Slightly shift to the road near 93 Foster Street, so we could get the 3:1 side slopes on the side of the road for snow storage purposes. Also confirmed that Foster Street is super elevated in the area where we are proposing the road to merge onto Foster Street so bottoming should not be an issue.
- \* A sign was moved based on the peer reviewer input.
- \* The location of the electric and the cable has been confirmed with the electric department. It is 3 feet off the left side of the road.
- \* The proposed street trees have been moved a little further away from the road to make room for those underground utilities, and added more information to the retaining wall detail for the infiltration basin in front of the existing house at 93, so whoever builds this will know where to put that impervious barrier.

The revised plan set has been submitted with the revision letter. The peer reviewer and the town engineer said they were satisfied.

Mr. Montanari asked about the granite walls. Mr. Karr responded; the town engineer, Chris, requested we remove those granite walls to make room for a sidewalk. Ms. Toohill commented; in regards to scenic roadway special permit portion of it, there are some conditions you want to apply to this, such as rebuild/reuse. Developer agreed, noting they will save the granite and reuse it to within the development to be visible as part of the street scape. Mr. Mullen commented that since so many people are used to seeing the granite, it would be good to see it along both sides of Croft Circle, at the entrance somehow. Applicants are willing to do that. Will incorporate into the front entrance design.

Mr. Montanari agreed the revised road layout is better.

Mr. Mullen commented that we need to make sure the drainage is maintained by the developer and doesn't go to the town, we are not going to be maintaining it. Applicant responded that the maintenance will be done by the home owner's association, developer will operate it until the last home is sold, will be done in conjunction with the residents there.

Ms. Cruz expressed support for reuse of the stone walls onsite.

Ms. Hueston questioned a comment on the peer review letter, page 6, waiver from 249-43D.

“While the proposed design does not meet the section 249-43D, the design does meet the requirements in Mass DOT PD & DG.” The applicant explained that Littleton's regulations are stricter than the PD & DG, for the driveway separation. Need to grant a waiver for Foster Street driveway. An independent third party was brought in to do a traffic study, and it has been worked out at DOT.

Mr. Mullen motioned to close the hearing, Mr. Scott seconded. All in favor to close the Definitive Open Space 5:0.

Vote conditions:

Disposition of the open space parcels – Mr. Mullen recommended conveying it to the town.

Mr. Montanari asked if there were public comments, none were presented at this time.

Mr. Mullen motioned to approve the special permit as proposed, designed, negotiated and granted, per the draft decision and the town council's final say, and on condition that we see a layout for the scenic roadway. Mr. Scott seconded. All in favor, 5:0.

### **Board Business**

A. **Bills and Payroll** - Ms. Toohill - there are three sets of bills. One is for the Littleton Common revitalization work, with areas for the Planning Board and the Master Plan Implementation Committee to sign. There are also other bills that have come in during the last month, in the other two packets. Ms. Hueston had no chance to review the one for Fort Point, so won't be signing it. Recommended that the board to hold off signing it. Time sheets also reflect the time for department clerk.

B. **Board Member Updates** – Ms. Cruz: the Agricultural Working Group is looking for an appointee from the Planning Board to sit on that board. Wanted to confirm a formal vote was taken. Mr. Montanari confirmed that Ms. Cruz got appointed to it. Plan to hold a discussion at the Retreat on how to improve the Planning Board, and ways to make it run better. Mr. Mullen agrees it is a good idea. A lengthy discussion followed regarding scheduling; date, time, and location to be determined.

### **8. Public Hearing – 234 Taylor Street – Adult Use Marijuana Establishment**

Applicants Jason Sidman CEO of Sanctuary, and Director of Cultivation Nicholas Satmary were present. The Public Hearing was opened with the reading of the hearing notice as published in the Littleton Independent. Mr. Sidman provided an overview of the application, stating that they are a fully operational facility, growing and cultivating since March 2018. Looking to move forward to the adult use program, which changes nothing in the facility. It is simply changing tags on the plants, and different accountability.

Mr. Mullen indicated this is just a formality since the applicants already have a special permit.

Mr. Montanari summarized: you are looking to apportion the product to medicinal form and part of it for recreational, but it's the same product. Applicant explained that the plants just get tagged differently, and allocated into the systems differently.

In reply to Mr. Montanari's question if it is all the same product, but in a number of different forms, Mr. Sidman replied that it is not really the same. It is in the same forms, but there are a couple of slight differences, one being dosage. The adult usage program has dosage restrictions, where the medical program doesn't, on any specific edible. In addition, all products must have individually, clearly marked THC. The other difference between the medical and recreational product is in the amount of milligrams per serving. The serving size and max servings per container are also different.

Mr. Scott indicated it is all state regulated. Reiterated that all growing practices and contents are the same. The packaging and dosages are different. The applicant clarified that the controlling commissions are also different. For recreational product, it's the Cannabis Control Commission instead of the DPH for medical. The Cannabis Control Commission will be governing both the adult use licenses as well as the medical licenses going forward. Mr. Scott indicated since there are no changes, for example no collection of monies or packaging from here, he did not have any issues. Ms. Hueston said she visited the facilities, and reported that everything is very secure and methodical, in terms of what each partitioned room is responsible for doing with the marijuana. She feels it would be very difficult to manipulate anything in the facility. Mr. Scott and Mr. Mullen confirmed. Ms. Hueston reminded the public that there are monetary benefits as well as community service hours associated with having the facility in town, that this represents a contribution to the town. Mr. Scott motioned to approve the application. Mr. Mullen seconded. All in favor, 5:0.

**Public Input – in regards to 234 Taylor Street** - After the vote was taken, a resident came forward to complain about a bad odor detected outside the facility. The resident has informed the facility. Applicants confirmed they have a filtration system in place to prevent air contamination, however, there is no outside air quality testing outside, only inside. The air in the facility is recycled and not vented outside. Anthony Ansaldi, Interim Town Administrator stated that each time they get a complaint, they address the site; he has walked the site with the Police Chief. Mr. Mullen outlined a prior issue that was resolved. Ms. Hueston asked if the resident would track the issue. Mr. Sidman stated that they try to be the best neighbor they can; it is a different smell inside than what she is smelling outside; we will continue to work together; we are not exhausting anything outside except from the kitchen. Mr. Scott suggested the resident call him next time she smells it, and he will come out and check it with her.

### **Board Business**

**Commuter Rail Station** – Judi Barret. Met with the Planning Board on August 2 and introduced the project; submitted a draft public participation plan, and did a site walk. Working with Eric Halvorsen of RKG on the Market study and Peter Flinker of Dodson & Flinker on the base maps. Looking to schedule a Charrette weekend program sometime in the spring, to gather the major public input component. Stakeholder interviews will be held in December.

Ms. Hueston, asked about the project working group she is recommending; should a community resident should be working in that group? Specifically people who might be concerned about the Foster Street area, a way to make sure their specific input is obtained. Mr. Mullen noted that board representatives would take all views into account, and only an abutter may provide a skewed opinion. Ms. Hueston stated that we need to make sure that nearby residents are a target audience.

**Minutes** - Mr. Mullen motioned to approve the minutes of August 23, 2018 as drafted, Mr. Scott seconded. All in favor, 5:0

**Budget** – Ms. Toohill: 2 budget scenarios – level staffing and reach or mission budget staffing. Continuing Ms. Toohill’s salary 5 hours per week out of the MPIC and 35 out of the regular appropriation, and the clerk’s at 10 hours a week out of the MPIC capital appropriation, to be increased to 19 hours a week in 2019. Three capital items for studies to be prioritized and vetted are: the Great Road Corridor plan, budget \$65,000, Update Housing Production Plan \$50,000, MPIC \$50,000 associated with Littleton common study. More details from MPIC on Tuesday night.

Mr. Scott excused himself from the rest of the meeting.

9. **Couper Farm Estates** - discussion regarding Senior Affordable Units and project completion

Applicants Janet Field and attorney Jennifer Platt were present to discuss Senior Affordable Units at Dean Lane portion of Couper Farm, at the board’s request. Dean Lane was permitted, and is being developed under 55 and older bylaws. That project has started, construction is under way, and 3 units have been completed and sold. The expectation is to develop 16 to 20 units for the 55 and over, dependent on market conditions. Complications with this have been discussed with DHCD. Their interpretation of the town’s bylaws is that it goes beyond the age restrictions which would be permitted by the Feds and accordingly they are not allowing affordable units produced under the town’s bylaws to count in the subsidized housing inventory. Ms. noted that the town is in the process of talking with DHCD to see if this is a unique situation or not; we have done a lot in the past to support affordable housing. Mr. Mullen noted that this is the last development permitted under the old bylaw. Ms. Platt noted that it is the developer’s intent is to provide these units and it’s more of a matter how to market them, if DHCD doesn’t get involved. Janet Field noted that interest in the affordable units is high, and they have hired MCO as a marketing resource. MCO is concerned that they would not consider the affordable units to be included in the subsidized housing inventory; Ms. Field noted that they are anxious to move forward on the affordable units.

Ms. Field outlined the proposed timeline, noting that they hope for 2 phases of construction, allowing a minimum of 5 months to get someone through the approval process, but if DHCD is not involved, it will move faster. Mr. Montanari asked how many affordable units would be developed. Ms. Field noted that stated that there would be 4, potentially 5 affordable units, 25% of the total construction. Mrs. Toohill noted that the plans approved show 24 total units. Ms. Platt noted that the property would not support 24 units; the proposal is to build 16 or 20 total. Mr. Montanari stated that the most important thing is getting affordable units, whether they count or not. Ms. Platt stated that the applicants need to find out which marketing process to follow, and that requires feedback to the town from the state. Once we have that direction, we can get started on it.

Ms. Field noted that Federal Laws consider it discriminatory against families with children. The federal laws allow for a housing that’s geared toward the elderly by having one resident be 55 or older, but our bylaws are more restrictive, where no occupants can be under the age of 18.

Ms. Toohill noted that the town would have the authority to wave some of those age requirements from the zoning side, but no one at the town level can wave the requirements from the title 5 side.

The Applicant said they are in the situation where they've already sold houses to families, with the knowledge they will not have many families living next to them. Even if the change numbers change, it wouldn't work. It is part of the plans for the development, and everyone who has bought into them has accepted that regime.

Ms. Hueston stated the number of affordable units constrained by septic capacity, and asked shouldn't that have been determined in advance? Michael Field stated no, it doesn't work like that for a subdivision or definitive. Ms. Hueston asked about the original farmhouse being donated to the Town, and asked about the status on that house. Ms. Platt stated that the house will be donated towards the end of the construction project, in the interim, it is being used as an office. Interim Town Administrator Anthony Ansaldi indicated that there is no disposition date.

Ms. Cruz commented that the agricultural parcel in the front, on the East side, has been deeded to the town, but is not very useful for agriculture as is; she noted that planted trees and the final grading were not conducive to agricultural use. Mr. Field outlined the work that had been done on the property to make it more usable for agriculture; two fields were hayed last year.

The meeting adjourned for another Public Hearing.

**10. Continued Public Hearing – Between #80 and #94 King Street – Senior Residential Development Special Permit, Aquifer and Water Resource District Special Permit.** Attorney Jennifer Platt noted that plans were presented in September, and discussions had been in progress since March. She provided an overview of the proposal, a 17 unit development under the senior residential district; we have tried to make this development both accessible and livable for seniors in town. The plan responds to some of the things the board had requested, density has been reduced by half, units are all single level cottages or duplexes, 2 bedrooms in each, the living area is all on a single level, with zero clearance entrance, so it can be entered directly from the driveway, doorways are sized to accommodate a wheel chair. The added amenities make this a more interesting project, they propose tennis courts to make a very active area, a walking trail, as well as a gazebo, open space for a gathering area, and community garden beds. Curb cuts were reduced by sharing driveways, architectural interest added with interesting architecture details, and open space around the back to provide spaciousness around the units. Ms. Platt referenced Judi Barrett's peer review comments, noting that further clustering with townhouse units was not preferred by the Board. Updated architectural plans were presented, showing single-level units.

Ms. Cruz asked about a second means of egress; Mr. Montanari noted this development is proposed with 19 units, so it is not an issue. Mrs. Toohill noted that the Fire Department had reviewed the layout and they were not concerned with access. Mr. Mullen noted that design features and amenities were added and thanked the applicant for adding those, and asked that they add features where people can rest along the walking trail. Michael Field stated he met with Mr. Lynn to discuss the tennis courts; he is on board; we are waiting for the next step to figure out whether a portion of the lane gets donated to the high school. Mr. Mullen asked for follow up with town council to determine how it gets donated, whether it is a shared easement access; they should be open to everyone and for follow up with Mr. Lynn about design specifications. Ms. Hueston asked that all details be memorialized in the decision rather than being at the end of the development phase to make sure everyone knows what the expectations are. Mr. Mullen clarified that the town wants to see the high school tennis courts donated before the construction starts. Mr. Montanari asked who would construct the tennis courts. Mr. Field noted that he would do the majority of the work, donate the land, and prepare it for surfacing. Janet Field noted this detail should be finalized.

Ms. Hueston asked if the existing trees will all be cut. Michael Field responded that only the ones needing to be cut for the constructions, and to provide some flat surrounding area. Ms. Hueston requested the developer leave as many existing trees as possible.

Mr. Montanari referred to Judi Barrett's review letter, and asked if Littleton is gaining enough public benefit from this development to compensate for the density that exceeds what is permitted as of right, going from 3 houses to 17. Applicant responded they are creating a community of smaller, easier to maintain houses, more affordable to operate; the goal is to make these affordable for people downsizing, accessible to many more people. Heat pumps will be included to help keep the units affordable to operate. Will include 2 affordable units; Mr. Field noted that the duplex units will be a lower price point. Mr. Montanari noted that he would like to see money donated towards a van for transporting the residents in town. Mr. Ansaldi noted that there are COA 2 vans now, which are over-subscribed, there is need for another one. Mr. Montanari asked about the balance, and the possibility of building a senior center, or put money aside for the council on aging. He feels it would be more beneficial than tennis courts. Applicant requested that the board put a proposal together for developer approval. Ms. Cruz indicated she needs to see in writing a proposal that will show what the developer will do in exchange for the density.

Attorney Sherrill Gould, representing the property owners Patricia Webber and family, stated that the Town approved the bylaw, increasing the costs of development would increase the cost to the end user. A discussion of market sales price followed. Patricia Webber, 2 Jeanette Way noted that all the patience her assistant sees need something like this development; "help the old people". Ms. Cruz noted that she was not opposed to the development proposal; all details would have to be written down and agree to. Mr. Mullen proposed that instead of the fee toward the van, the builder could start a fund that would go to the affordable housing trust fund for the Town of Littleton, not to exceed \$3000 per unit, except the affordable units. Ms.

Hueston agree with Mr. Mullen. Janet Field agreed this was acceptable; for financing we have to make sure that everything can work. Mr. Montanari wants to see the cost of the units. The applicant indicated they need plenty of time to discuss all and get it approved by board. Greg Roy noted that the detailed site plans had been provided; the Board noted that the engineering review should be able to be complete by the next meeting.

Mr. Mullen motioned to continue the Public Hearing to January 10, 2019, Ms. Cruz seconded. All in favor, 4:0.

**9:00 –Baron Way** - Attorney Sherry Gould, and her client Jenny Baron were present. Ms. Gould noted that this is an informal discussion of a potential lot division on Baron Way. Lot 3, containing 3.3 acres, from Baron Way to Spectacle Pond, and another 1 acre called Parcel Way, totaling about 4.2 acres. The lot is about 2 or 3x the size of other lots in the area. Precedent; Lots on Cricket Lane; developed up to a certain point, going down to the water. The Planning Board gave frontage rights for the development of new homes, although they were not 15” or 20’ off Cricket Lane. Applicant is asking for the same right to develop.

Trying to configure 2 or 3 lots from Ms. Baron’s parcel. Tried to get a short cul-de-sac off Spectacle Pond, and get a 3 lot subdivision, so they would have real frontage on Spectacle Pond for the 3 lots, however, the ratios and coefficients didn’t work. It worked nicely to actually portion off Ms. Baron’s house, which is the plan presented. Asked to give Ms. Baron’s house a conforming 1 acre with frontage on Baron Way, which has been her frontage since 1995. Proposing to piece off Ms. Baron’s conforming 1 acre lot with frontage on Baron Way, and create a new “hammer head” lot, with a 35’ neck on Spectacle, a 150 square and the 2 acres.

The Board reviewed the proposed layout. Mr. Montanari suggested not acting on the ANR when it is submitted. Ms. Gould indicated that an ANR plan would be filed for the January 10 meeting date.

It was moved by Mark, seconded by Ed, and voted 6:0 to adjourn.

#### **DOCUMENTS:**

Agenda

Newtown Road ANR Plan

195 Tahattawan Road Preliminary Subdivision (see Planning Board files for additional detail)

Application

Plans

The Point Sign Standards with Plans

93 Foster Street 9-Lot Open Space Subdivision “The Homes at Croft Common”

Updated Project Letter

Sheet 5 Subdivision Plans 10/30/2018 (see Planning Board files for additional detail)

Peer Review Letter Nov. 19, 2018

November 29, 2018 DRAFT Decision in progress

234 Taylor Street (see Planning Board files for additional detail)

Public Hearing Notice

Application

Couper Farm Estates overview plan  
Between #80 and #94 King Street (see Planning Board files for additional detail)  
King Street Layout plan  
Option 1 and Option 2 architectural layouts  
Barrett Peer Review Letter  
Baron Way – sketch plan for ANR  
Board Business  
Bills and Payroll (Accounting Department files)  
FY2020 Budget (Accounting Department files)  
Littleton Station Study Area Status Report

DRAFT