

Planning Board Minutes Monday, January, 16, 2024

Approved: February 5, 2024

Chair Jeff Pallis at 6:35pm, called the meeting to order. Members present: Joan Simmons, Joe VLcek and Jim Wilkie Member self-recused during portion of meeting: Alan Chaney

Meeting held: At the Dunstable Town Hall, 511 Main Street, lower level.

Local Initiative Proposal (LIP) Brattle Development – 41 Lowell St

Joint Meeting with Affordable Housing Committee Members present: Chair Jon Hughes, Carol Bacon, Deborah Courtney, Kieran Meehan, Matthew Naughton

As a property abutter to the project location, PB member Alan Chaney recused himself from the Board and did not participate in questioning or discussion.

At 6:35pm Chairs Jeff and Jon welcomed the Brattle Development team to present their LIP project to the two assembled boards and members of the public in attendance. Jeff noted the goal of the meeting was for the two boards to gain more understanding about the LIP proposal and formulate non-binding recommendations for the Dunstable Select Board to consider in a future decision on the project.

Link to available related documents, including presentation displayed: <u>LIP Development Proposal: 41 Lowell Street | Dunstable MA (dunstable-ma.gov)</u>

Attorney <u>Jess Schomer</u> opened his presentation by introducing the key members of the team who were in attendance or expected to arrive shortly:

Brattle Development represented by: Legal: Jesse D. Schomer, Esq. – Regnante Sterio Fiscal Impacts: Mark Fougerre – Fougere Planning & Development Architecture: Daniel M. Skolski, AIA – DMS Design, LLC. Site/Civil: David Mackwell – Kelly Engineering Group



Traffic: Robert J. Michaud, P.E., MSCE – MDM Transportation Consultants, Inc. Marketing Feasibility: Thomas Skahen – Streamline Communities Ownership present: James Tully, Mathew McGovern

Jesse referred to his PowerPoint presentation and opened with an aerial view of the project location on 41 Lowell Street. He offered salient points of:

- Site comprised of open space with a utility easement for existing overhead power lines
- Identified in Dunstable's 2016 Housing Production Plan as a developable site for affordable housing (refer to pages 54-55)
- Proposed development project consists of 156 units; mix of single-family type houses, duplexes and garden style apartments
- 356 total parking spaces; more than 2 per unit with mix of covered surface and attached garages.
- Proposed common clubhouse near front of site
- Series of walking trails around site in open space area at rear of site which is not proposed to be developed
- Adjacent property with buildings is planned to be renovated and donated to Town as potential garage facility.
- Project will be age restricted with residents to be age 55+.
 - Eligible for treatment under the Housing for Older Person's Act of 1985 requiring 85% of units to be occupied by at least one 55+ aged occupant.
 - Discourages school age children in the age restricted property. Few if any children expected in such a project.
- Condominiums will have 39 affordable units which are deed-restricted for residency by eligible residents who earn not greater than 80% of Area Medium Income (AMI). Selection would be done by lottery closer to sale/occupancy point, after construction, and conducted by SEB Group, LLC.
- Mix of condominium units consisting of:
 - o 32 townhouse style: 12 duplexes and 8 single-family, free standing units
 - 3 garden style multi-family buildings; 124 units total (broken down as 41, 41, 42 per building)
 - Common clubhouse with meeting space, community kitchen, fireplace, TV room, fitness center, game room and pool outside
 - Coordination with Town to open for locals' community use.



Addressing the affordability needs in the Town of Dunstable, Jesse shared:

- Currently, there are no qualifying units in Town which count by the Massachusetts Executive Office of Housing and Livable Communities on the Town's subsidized housing inventory.
- Town of Dunstable remains eligible for Chapter 40B developments
- This project is proposed as a Local Initiative Project (LIP) or a "friendly 40B" and the Brattle Team hope to earn the support of the Boards in attendance tonight.
- Feedback and support is sought as the project proceeds
- Dunstable's 2016 Housing Production Plan recommended 75-135 new affordable housing units and this project site was recommended
- Project site provides options for local seniors who would like to age in place within the community they raised their family verses moving out
- Site is out of sight, with plans for heavy landscaping to limit view of larger buildings from Lowell St.

Jess highlighted the following benefits of this project to the Town:

- 1. Connection of new units to Town's existing public water infrastructure to help fund those prior investments. Increasing rate payers by 150% over existing customer base, to help stabilize public water system and make prior investments worthwhile.
- 2. Town will have access to clubhouse, walking trails and conservation land.
- 3. Phased construction taking a number of years to build; starting with duplexes and single-family houses in front. Providing construction employment and other jobs which benefit the local economy.
- 4. Project will have a net positive fiscal impact on the Town's tax base.

Jesse wrapped up his portion of the presentation with a question from Board member Joan S. about the lottery for affordable units. She wondered if there would be a local preference. Jesse noted that the state allows a local preference, typically 70% of the affordable units during the initial sales period. State requires the Town to submit a letter of support for such.

Board member Jim presented a follow-up question around how long this local preference period lasts. Jesse shared that it applies to the first occupancy and for as long as the local senior stays in the unit. Any next sale could go to any one, in or outside of the local community.



Chair Jeff inquired about the local governance over the development. Jesse replied there would be a condominium/homeowners' association which regulates it. HOPA act has specific requirements about how projects like this are managed and presented/advertised as "55+". The units themselves are subject to binding deed restrictions that require only residents that qualify under the 40B program with income eligibility.

Board member Joe inquired about whether the units will be rentals or all for sale. Jesse noted they are proposing they all be condominiums, but at the December meeting with the Select Board it was requested they consider converting some of the garden-style to rentals. They are still considering this request.

<u>Mark Fougerre</u>, of Fougere Planning & Development, presented the fiscal impact report and shared:

- Analysis showed gross revenues of approximately 1.6 million dollars comprised of:
 - Property taxes, vehicle excise taxes, CPA 3% community surcharge and water enterprise fund
- Analysis of an age restricted property impact on police, fire and EMS calls was reviewed with the Town's Fire and Police Chiefs. Agreed on reasonable projected call estimates of:
 - 56 calls for Police / \$20,000 cost per year
 - 15 calls for Fire / \$40,000 cost per year
 - 19 calls for EMS (via a private entity; although Fire Chief noted they respond as well)
- Assigned costs for Council of Aging, miscellaneous Town costs for other departments and the enterprise fund which will generate \$400,000 offset by community

Total positive impact for this type of development is over one million dollars. New town residents will provide economic activity to the overall area/community.

All on-site maintenance for the property, trash, plowing, roads, will be privately managed.

School children impact is expected to be low with analysis of a NH 1,100-unit over 55+ development having 5 children living with residents. Other Massachusetts based over 55+ properties in Lynnfield and Reading were reviewed and no children were residents to be of impact. This does not mean there will not be any children enrolled in the school system.



Committee member Kieran asked Mark for additional clarification around the Police and Fire call metrics, and how the counts were determined. Mark replied that he used a cost average approach, taking the Police budget and dividing it by the average calls per year. A cost per call of \$260 was determined. With 56 calls estimated, the \$14,000 Police cost was determined.

Similarly, for Fire, it was determined to be \$1,200 per call. With 15 calls estimated. Including the supporting response for 19 private EMS calls, the \$40,000 Fire cost was determined. Between the two departments Brattle had estimated \$60,000 in cost to the town per year.

Committee Chair Jon inquired about the increase in calls which the additional 156 units' residents might add. Mark referred to data from analysis of similar 55+ developments, and noted it was calls to this site – not including off site Police calls from these residents.

Chair Jeff inquired about a potential fire alarm in one of the larger garden-style buildings resulting in evacuation of the entire building. This might result in the Town's entire force of Fire and Police being needed on-site, leaving the rest of the Town's needs unable to be responded to – and possibly requiring additional headcount. Architect Dan spoke up to note that the modern fire alarms only result in impacted units and those directly neighboring being evacuated.

Additional questions from the board around how call estimates and demands throughout the community impacted the estimated costs. The questions raised were to consider whether the Town had the right equipment and capacity to respond to any increase in calls.

Board member Joe inquired about whether the Developer would provide funding for third party consultants to review the costs presented and do studies for feedback to the Town. Jesse responded that peer reviewing is required by 40B and the Developer would fund. He noted there is no guidelines for such, but "reasonable cost" is expected. Joe indicated this could be one of the recommendations made to the Select Board.

Committee member Matthew inquired about the "no children" estimate. Tom Skahen responded that studies of over 55+ projects do show it to be rare that children reside within these types of developments. It does happen, but it's rare. Joan chimed in to note that GDRD has a highly rated district which tends to attract families with school age



children. The school system in Lynnfield was noted to be attractive as well, but no children resided within the comparison development.

Before handing off to the architectural review presentation, Jesse brought up the water enterprise fund issue. They understand the investment made by the Town, that the upgraded water system has a lot of capacity and needs new rate payers. The average annual cost of a water bill is \$2,700 per user. By expanding the rate payer base and adding these 156 units/users, it will reduce that cost by about half to approximately \$1,400 annually.

Dan Skolski, of DMS Design presented the architectural overview and shared:

- The site is far off the main roads. An entry drive passes the garage and the shared clubhouse with pool centered around the pond feature. The drive passes a row of single family homes, then ringing the site are the duplexes with the apartment buildings further back.
- The shared clubhouse has a traditional New England vernacular emulating a barn with hip roofs, gable roofs, overhangs to create depth on the rakes/eaves, stone façade, portico entry, traditional cupola, a tower element, trimmed divided glass windows, red siding, white siding, vertical and horizontal clapboard. While for the residents primarily, they are intending to offer access to seniors in town to utilize as well.
- Duplexes have multi-roof scenario, with garages, trim work, overhangs for shadow line and depth. Color scheme is simple.
- Single family homes have stone at the base, board and batten and clapboard siding, black double-hung windows with some fixed windows. Two car garages with adjoining mud room, living/dining areas, master bedroom suite on the main floor and guest suites upstairs.
- The apartment buildings have a main gable roof along the length of the building, and bisecting gable roofs where balconies are. There is a stone base with a timber wood pergola style element at main entry, with single, double and triples of double-hung windows. Board and batten siding at first floor and clapboard on 2nd and third stories.

Joan inquired about the length of the building. Dan replied 340' long by 75' wide.



• The apartment buildings have single garages on the first floor and a single corridor with units on one side against the lobby. Floors two and three have double-sided corridor with units on both sides. There are a mix of one, two and three bedroom units in each building.

Deborah inquired about whether all units had garage parking. Dan replied that all the stand alone single and duplexes had attached garages but the apartments had some underneath or nearby freestanding covered parking.

Jim commented about the architectural appeal and options for changes. Dan replied there is some room for flexibility on siding, colors, trim, and roof configuration based on boards input.

Kieran inquired about the decision for three buildings vs. possibly having four buildings with a reduced unit count. Dan replied that site design, aesthetics and economics were factors in the decision. They had tried multiple things but they were trying to remain more compact to retain open space and distance to neighbors. They chose to put more detail into the building design vs. having more buildings.

Deborah inquired about any reference developments designed and built by Dan's firm. Dan replied they specialize in multi-family of all sizes. They do projects which are traditional, like this one, contemporary urban throughout the area and referred to the firm's website for examples. He shared that they had designed Bedford Green in Bedford, NH a few years ago. These proposed apartment buildings are ~20% longer.

Jim inquired whether the single-family and duplex units were identical or nearly identical. Dan replied yes, to which Jim inquired if there was any desire to break them up and offer different roof lines. Dan responded that there had been schemes with different colors and siding but that seemed too busy and not worked as well. He noted it was not an unreasonable request to relook at design options if the boards requested such.

Joe inquired about the clubhouse maintenance given potential use by the Town. Dan replied that the property would maintain the clubhouse, even if there was an agreement for use by people in the Town.



Committee member Matthew inquired about the single driveway entrance on Lowell Road and whether there was any need for an entrance elsewhere, perhaps access onto Westford Street.

Civil Engineer, <u>David Mackwell</u>, provided an overview of the property:

- Entire property is ~77 acres
- The project area, including the driveway and planned developed area, is ~21 acres
 - 10 acres of which will be green space
 - 9-10 acres will be impervious pavement and/or buildings (including existing garage facility and 2 residential homes already on the site)
 - Room for emergency access if Town wants it
- Only thing on site today is existing garage building and power lines. There are wetlands, with the pond, and farther south on the property. They will be working with Conservation Commission given work expected in the buffer zone.
- Mix of single-family, duplex and 3 apartment buildings with 356 total parking stalls. Single and duplexes have 2 car garages and room for two more vehicles in the driveways. Each apartment building has 24 single parking garages within and 32 parking stalls nearby.

Position of development and heights of buildings in a scale that starts from the road with the shorter single-family buildings up front, pass the clubhouse and then to the apartment buildings in the back. The closest building to Lowell Street is ~375' away. The closest building to Main Street is 750' away. The taller buildings are 1,120' to Main St. and 800' to Lowell Street.

There is a lot of green space and the project was designed to be part of the community. They made a commitment to work with public trails which are there now and will be available to residents and the public.

Dave continued to note:

- Over 2 parking spaces per unit
- Demand for a wastewater treatment plant on-site (not designed as of yet)
- No concerns for sewage disposal or drainage given spread of area and quality of soils
- 75% of site will remain open space



Joe asked about the square footage for sewage treatment to manage the property. Dan noted it would be only a few thousand square feet and within a garage type looking building. It would be pumped to a subsurface leeching field onsite. Water usage per unit, based on Title V, is estimated to 110 gallons per bedroom. For the total 316 bedrooms that works out to 35,000 gallons per day of designed flow rate. They usually see about 60% of that and it will probably be about 20,000 gallons daily.

Jeff inquired about how the sewage plant would work. Dan responded there are multiple reservoirs and tanks within the buildings and would be treated as it goes along. A consultant will be brought on-board to design the sewage treatment plan in accordance with the state codes.

Emergency access was discussed further with Dan noting that it's infrequently or never used. He noted that fire departments argue against such and comment about "*getting their chain saw out and moving falling trees*" and not driving around to alternate access. This site has plenty of frontage on Lowell Street as well as Main Street with the ability to add emergency access if needed.

Jeff inquired about the lighting plan and any requirements for lighting to the top of the tower area. Dan noted a lighting plan has not been done yet, but he expects 20' poles with LED lighting, all dark-sky compliant, modern lighting that is hardly seen.

Jeff also inquired about storm drainage. Dan noted they don't have a storm water management plan yet, but they have plenty of room for LID techniques, rain gardens, drainage swales, and the soils are well-draining.

Jeff inquired about the road sloping onto Lowell St. or if it inclines into the property. Dan replied that the pond was 8' lower that the road. The property generally slopes from the road, down and if there were any runoff they'd put a catch basin to capture it. They expect to maintain all storm water on property and find effluent disposal for the sewage system. They will meet or exceed all state storm water standards.

Next up, traffic consultant, <u>Bob Michaud</u>, shared their study was conducted to a state level standard, looking at existing ground conditions to understand traffic flow, crash rates, incidents, and trends to project into the future what they believe would happen with a



project like this in place. The study sought to project how much additional traffic would be generated, what direction would it be traveling and at what time of day would the roadway systems be used along with normal area growth. They look at baseline conditions and grow out 7 years into the future to understand how driveway, nearby intersections and roadways will function.

Bob went on to share the key points from the traffic report/assessment as:

- Project itself, although 156 units, is not a high traffic generator per se (55+ and over developments have a lot of data nationally to refer to)
- A peak commuter hour (morning or evening) would generate about 40 vehicle trips or less. This equates to 20 vehicles or so leaving or coming back to the property in an hour. One vehicle trip added every few minutes.
- Roadway conditions evaluated the effect of this additional traffic with a capacity analysis. Analysis in most cases shows a 10 second delay. Most problematic being left hand turns, from major street to major street – Lowell St to Main Street, for example. Delays in those cases are less than 30 seconds, which are well within acceptable parameters in Massachusetts.
- Safety characteristics are paramount and more important than time to take a turn, so crash trends were carefully reviewed. Based on Dept. Motor Vehicle crash data, Lowell and Main Street intersection has a 3X lower crash rate than statewide average. Rate of occurrence therefore does not require a safety improvement.
- Looking at the driveway area, consideration of travel speeds occurring near it and sightlines to bear, such that vehicles approaching it can be clearly seen to turn. The study showed they far exceeded the minimum criteria for safety in turning onto or out of the driveway.
- The study was conducted in Spring of 2021 and again in 2023 to quantify volume conditions which were grown out to 2030, as the basis of the assessment.
- A graphical depiction of the major intersection (Lowell and Main Streets) was presented with trips during AM peak hour commuter periods between 7-9 AM. Trip patterns were predominantly flowing northbound towards Rte. 3
 - 700-800 vehicles per hour northbound
 - Just over 200 traveling southbound per hour
 - Lowell St. carries less than 200 vehicles directionally during peak hours. In the morning it's heavier eastbound than westbound, and the equivalent reverse in the evening.
 - Main Street carries about 13,000 vehicles per day.



- Lowell Street carries just under 3,000 vehicles per day.
- Additional trips introduced as a result of this project are:
 - 20 vehicle trips per hour added to Lowell Street
 - < 10 vehicle trips per hour added to the Main Street</p>
- Journey to work data information, published by the US Census, provides which communities Dunstable residents work in. 50-50 split between Main and Lowell Streets. Not high volumes so not sensitive to variations.
- 1 additional trip every three minutes onto Lowell Street
- 1 additional trip every five minutes onto Main Street
- A graphical depiction of the major intersection (Lowell and Main Streets) was presented with trips during PM peak hour commuter periods.
 - Similar to AM
 - Difference is there is a higher proportion of trips coming back

Kieran noted a concern with utilizing data from 2021. It was highlighted that 2023 was also measured. Bob further shared they trended using current conditions and made adjustments for 2021 using state guidelines. He noted that in 2023 volume conditions and assumptions used were conservative "worse case". While growth patterns in this area are less than .5%/year or negative, they applied a .5-1% growth rate. Therefore, the volumes presented in this study are higher than will likely occur.

Jim asked what numbers would need to been seen in order to have a traffic signal light. Bob replied "*a lot more traffic than shown*". Traffic volume is the primary driver for a signal. If this were a state highway, which it is not, the state would require a 100 vehicle/hour minimum for each of the 8 hours of the day. A higher volume on the side-street for an extended period is used to justify a signal light. This location doesn't come close to such.

In conclusion, Bob highlighted, the site is a low-impact site from a traffic perspective. There are no high-crash locations that would dictate the need for safety improvements. The driveway will be designed to meet applicable safety based standards for sight lines.

Regarding Matthew's earlier question for an additional driveway, the volumes at the driveway during peak hours do not justify a need for an additional driveway. There will be more discussion on the need for alternative emergency access to the property. The small boulevard design of the project's driveway will provide more flexibility for how an



emergency response would need to happen at the site. The length of the roadway is not extensive but additional discussion with emergency personnel could occur to further review and modify.

A final presenter, <u>Thomas Skahen</u>, of Streamline Communities, a real estate advisor, is performing a market feasibility study. While the study is not completed yet, they are looking at "for rent vs. for sale". He noted "for rent" is unique for an age restricted development. He noted the market is very strong currently. The housing supply is limited for both affordable and market rate homes, both for sale and for rent. Buyers and renters are waiting in line for units to be delivered. For sale units are typically sold within 30 days.

The lack of supply is increasing the pricing in both for sale and for rent. Until there is relief with new construction in MA, they expect to see prices continue to go up for both. They believe this development hits all the marks for keeping a lot of open space, but density for the builder and produces some affordable homes.

Joe asked about the tax implications for the affordable units. If taxes need to go up, are there any restrictions for the affordable units? Jesse responded that it's based on the assessed value of the units.

Jim asked about the ~82 million valuation and how it was determined. Tom referred to page 5 of the report which breaks down the price points. Garden building units' average sale price is \$600K, and affordable units are at \$226K assessed value. If assessed for such, they would be taxed at that rate. Duplexes were \$700K and singles at \$800K to reach ~83 million.

Deborah asked about the developments projected timeline for starting construction. Jesse projected a year out to get ZBA and Select Board approvals, followed by wetland permitting, sewage treatment design. It would likely be at least two years to secure approvals, financing, etc. before construction commenced.

Carol asked about what area was use for the area medium income. Owner James Tully responded Northern Middlesex and the Lowell area. Jesse indicated that the numbers were out of date at this point.



Deborah asked about the pool and any reasoning for including it in a 55+ community. The owners responded that they are considering removing the pool.

Joe inquired about the size of the project at 156 units relative to the size of Dunstable. He wondered why they were filing as a Local Initiative Project and what the benefit was to the developer. Jesse clarified a LIP is a benefit to the town from a financial perspective. He added that Joe seemed to be referring to a large project cap under 40B. If this was a hostile 40B, the developer would sequence it to break up to multiple projects for the same site. One project for the buildings, another for the duplexes, another for the single-family homes.

Joe's stated his concern about the large apartment buildings bringing a lot of units and people. He wondered if a further distribution of duplexes and removal of the apartment building units would be more suitable to the Town. He recommended that the two boards work on proposals further.

Jesse spoke to the density and size of the development and noted they understand this as an issue from earlier feedback received. He shared that they've learned from prior meetings that there is a desire to add a significant number of affordable housing units to the Town. In a Town like Dunstable, there are not a lot of sites available to have the density like this that will not impede on residential properties without more impact. This site offers a lot of open space with the opportunity to hide and tuck the larger units towards the back of the site. The design of the site allows the Town to accomplish significant goals towards affordable housing with minimal impact on the neighbors.

Joe asked what the Large Project Threshold for a town the size of Dunstable is. Jesse indicted he would have to get back to the Board with an answer. He further noted that Large Project Thresholds could still be approved by the Town despite exceeding it, but the state looks at it as a consideration. It's not a rule that the project cannot be larger than the threshold.

The Affordable Housing Committee offered their initial recommendation of encouraging the development to move forward but to have the 124 garden style apartments all be rentals. This would allow them to all count toward the affordable housing inventory needed.



Marketer Tom chimed in to note that age restricted rentals are a challenge. It could be a setback to the developer and less profitable. Jon asked if the outstanding feasibility study could determine the cutoff point to determine profitability if it were to include rentals. He requested a copy of the study be offered as soon as possible so the data could be considered in the forthcoming final recommendations. Tom noted it could be 2-4 weeks out until finalized.

Multiple members present shared their positive feedback on the presentation and noted their appreciation for the developers' interest in working with the Town to come up with the best possible project and outcome.

Joe motioned that the PB meet again with the AHC on Monday, February 5th to determine their recommendations to present to the Select Board by February 9th. Jim seconded the motion. Motion passed 4-0.

Kieran motioned for the AHC to join the PB at a joint meeting on Monday, February 5th. Matt seconded the motion. Motion carried.

Planning Board member Alan Chaney returned to his seat with the boards.

O River Street/Unkety Brook Way Subdivision Affordable Housing Unit

The Administrator shared email feedback from the proposed purchaser of the development indicating they had pushed out the closing date again. He noted a conversation with the two boards might take place after ownership was transferred.

Jeff reminded those present that the AHC's preference was for the subdivision developer to build the affordable housing unit, and not accept any "in lieu of" payment. Jon and the committee agreed and added that the 3% contribution to the AHF for the remaining 5 units was still expected.

Joe brought up the idea of the affordable unit to be built possibly be turned into a duplex. This would add two units to the inventory.



Carol noted that the existing zoning bylaw appears incorrect. It is written "29.2.3 "*Eligible Household*" shall mean a household whose total combined annual income does not exceed 80% of AMI." It ought to refer to the purchaser paying only 30% of income towards housing, including expenses and fees.

It was requested that the Administrator contact the potential purchaser and encourage him to attend a future PB meeting to review and clarify the bylaw requirements.

Joe motioned that the joint meeting of the AHC and PB be adjourned at 9:22pm. Motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

Member for Brattle Development Jan. 24th LIP Technical Review Meeting

A meeting of all the interested Town boards to review the technical project details is scheduled for January 24th and a PB member is needed to represent the Board.

Alan made a motion to nominate Jeff Pallis to serve as the Board's representative at the January 24th meeting to review the technical details of the 41 Lowell Street/Brattle Development proposal. Joe seconded the motion. – Motion passed unanimously.

Master Plan Implementation Committee Nomination

Alan made a motion to nominate Joe Vlcek to serve as the Planning Board representative to the newly forming Town Master Plan Implementation Committee. Jim seconded the motion. – Motion passed unanimously.

Reschedule February 19th President's Day Holiday PB Meeting

Alan made a motion to reschedule the February 19th PB meeting to Tuesday, February 20th, 2024 at 6:30pm due to the upcoming President's Day holiday. Joe seconded the motion. – Motion passed unanimously.

Topics not reasonable anticipated by the Chair 48 hour in advance

<u>0 River Street/Unkety Brook Way Subdivision Special Permit Extension Needed</u>



The Administrator shared that the proposed purchaser of the development had emailed the office to note the SP was due to expire on February 2, 2024 – 18 months after approval. The owner has done deep hole testing, Perc testing, installed steel pins, etc. as the permits require. The proposed developer asked whether the Board considered these actions as "Commencement of Construction" or if there was a need to come to a PB meeting before February 2nd and request an extension of the special Permit?

Alan motioned that the Board agree that "*No, they do not consider this to be commencement of construction.*" Joan seconded the motion. Motion carried 3-2.

It was further recommended the Zoning/Building department comment for verification.

It was noted the current owner ought to be the one to request the SP extension. Jeff inquired whether it could be extended after it expires. It was recommended to consult with Town Counsel on how an expired SP could be extended.

Meeting Minutes – December 18, 2023

Joan made a motion to approve the minutes of the December 18th meeting. Alan 2^{nd} the motion. – Motion passed unanimously.

<u>Payroll</u>

Joe made a motion to sign off on two payrolls. Alan 2nd the motion. – Motion passed unanimously.

Bills and Hoyle Tanner Task Orders

	Motion to		
Item:	Approve	2nd	Vote
HT invoice 70328 , 532-542 Groton St ANR = \$323.75	Joe	Alan	unanimous
HT invoice 70329 , 532-542 Groton St SP = \$647.50	Alan	Joe	unanimous
HT Task Order #27 Am1 = \$783.00			
532-542 Groton Street ANR	Joan	Jim	unanimous
HT Task Order #28 Am1 = \$903.50			
532-542 Groton Street Special Permit	Jim	Alan	unanimous
HT invoice 70321 , 255 River St Spec Permit = \$1,184.75	Alan	Joe	unanimous
HT Task Order #15 Am3 = \$654.05			
255 River Street Special Permit & Land Disturbance Tier 2	Alan	Jim	unanimous



HT invoice 70324 , 160 Westford St, Land Disturb =			
\$1,748.00	Joe	Jim	unanimous
HT Task Order #23 Am1 = \$6,000.00			
Gateway Homes/160 Westford Street Land Disturbance			
Tier 2	Joe	Jim	unanimous
HT invoice 70325 , 315 River St, Land Disturb = \$1,289.25	Joe	Jim	unanimous
HT Task Order #24 Am1 = \$3,500.00			
315 River Street Land Disturbance Tier 1	Joe	Joan	unanimous
HT invoice 70326 , 73 Depot St, Land Disturb Tier 1 =			
\$350.50			
HT Task Order #25			
73 Depot Street Land Disturb Tier 1	Joe	Joan	unanimous
HT invoice 70327 , 75 Mill St, Land Disturb Tier 2 =			
\$1,275.00			
HT Task Order #26			
75 Mill Street Land Disturb Tier 2	Alan	Joe	unanimous

Joe made a motion to close the meeting at 9:57pm. Joan seconded the motion. – Motion passed unanimously.

The next scheduled meeting is Monday, February 5, 2024 at 6:30pm. The Planning Board will meet in the lower level Grange room at the Dunstable Town Hall.

Respectfully submitted, Carol A. Rock Administrative Assistant Dunstable Planning Board