



Town of Lancaster  
Planning Board  
Lancaster, Massachusetts 01523  
Approved: March 28, 2022

**Minutes of Wednesday, February 9, 2022**

**Administrative**

**1. Attendance Roll Call**

**Present:**

**Russ Williston, Chairman**

**Roy Mirabito, Vice Chairman**

**Carol Jackson, Clerk**

**Peter Christoph, Member**

**Tom Cristopher, Member**

**Staff present:**                **Jasmin Farinacci, Director of Community Development and Planning**

**Public Hearing**

**2. Continued Hearing: 201 Hilltop Road for approval of a Stormwater Management Plan – Haley Ward is performing the Engineer Review.**

The department has reached out to see if the applicant would like to request a continuance (Continued from 1/24/2022).

The applicant has requested a continuance until February 28, 2022.

**MOTION:**        **Motion made by Member Christopher and seconded by Member Jackson to continue the public hearing until February 28, 2022.**

**VOTE: (5-0-0)**

**Public Meeting**

**3. Discuss Proposed 40R Bylaw with Member(s) of the Lancaster Affordable Housing Trust**

**Present before the Board:**        **Victoria Petracca, Lancaster Affordable Housing Trust (LAHT)**

The Lancaster Affordable Housing Trust calls together their joint hearing with the Planning Board with members Jay Moody, Carolyn Read, Debra Williams, and Victoria Petracca.



Town of Lancaster  
Planning Board  
Lancaster, Massachusetts 01523  
Approved: March 28, 2022

Chairman Petracca states they have the proposed 40R by-law and received a letter from the Planning Board dated December 10, 2021. The Trust did include the language from the traffic review in the by-law. This was discussed January 19, 2022 at the Selectmen's meeting as point number 8. This is included in version 10 and is available online. The Trust also added the language from the inclusionary zoning by-law about segmentation has been included in the proposed 40R by-law under Section I.5. Traffic is Section H. The marijuana related uses originally proposed in the 40R By-law have been removed in Version 10. The infrastructure requirements for DHCD were discussed at the Selectmen's hearing and hopes that provided more clarity. The Trust is expected a Memorandum of Agreement for the 40R portion of the site only. This will be posted on the Lancaster Affordable Housing Trust as a draft when it is received. The estimated number of allowed units was a large point of discussion at the Selectmen's meeting. This number was discussed internally, and with DHCD and MRPC and they are looking from feedback from the Planning Board to dial down the capacity number.

The data density spreadsheet is shared by Member Petracca where it is explained in an excel spreadsheet provided by DHCD. The numbers are calculated by the spreadsheet from DHCD. MRPC worked on filling out the spreadsheet with the parcel information. The spreadsheet contains the parcel ID, including parcels that are not substantially developed as well as additional parcels that are substantially developed. This distinction between open land and substantially developed land is important. The soccer field is considered substantially developed land because they're in active use. The spreadsheet provides totals for the number of units in total capacity. These are not intended to be built in the near future, but are potential units. The concept is the district over time, and with the provided density (above 20 units/acre to meet 40R requirements) this number is how many units can be built over time. The state is not requiring that the Town build this number of units, but the calculation of the zoning incentive payment is based on the number of units built. The 1,132 units is taking into account the substantially developed parcels – for example if Dunkin Donuts was purchased and turned into housing units. The 674 units is at a density of 25 units/acre, which is the maximum as-of-right density. 40R the density must be 20 units/acre or above, the MBTA requirements are 15 units/acre. In regard to the number of units the units are not rounded up because there cannot be a partially constructed unit. If the number of units determined through the calculation in the spreadsheet is a decimal, it will round down to the nearest whole number. The parcel map units add up to 671 and 1,129 due to the acreage on the parcel, and the difference is due to the decimal point of remaining housing units. This explains the discrepancy between the map and the spreadsheet. 1,129 and 671 are the exact number of units they would seek approval for.

The LAHT likes the idea of reducing the scope of the project by removing the soccer field, which will reduce the project by 377 units and create a buffer between the proposed homes and the remainder of the site. Removing the soccer field also reduces acreage in the application. This does not affect the 40R application but will affect the site if we were intending to meet the MBTA requirements with the 40R. The MBTA legislation requires 50 acres. The district is currently at 64 acres. Removing the soccer field reduces the 40R to 44 acres. The MBTA does not require contiguous acreage, so this may not be a complication.



Town of Lancaster  
Planning Board  
Lancaster, Massachusetts 01523  
Approved: March 28, 2022

Member Jackson states that on Page 4 of the draft MBTA guidelines, it says reasonable size is a relative rather than an absolute determination because what is reasonable in one city or town may not be reasonable in another. Member Jackson feels that the MBTA may have room for negotiation on the acreage.

Chairman Williston asks if they can keep the MBTA conversation separate to avoid confusion.

Chairman Williston asks about the acreage of 44 acres without the soccer field if this is all buildable land or if this includes the substantially developed land. Chairman Petracca states that this is the gross acreage. The environmentally constrained land is just over 5 acres. Chairman Petracca states she could send Director Farinacci the excel spreadsheet to utilize to use different numbers of units and acres to see what the different outcomes of density would be.

Chairman Petracca shares the parcel map of the proposed 40R district. The numbers shown are from the excel spreadsheet. This is on the LAHT webpage on the 40R tab. The future zoned units are in purple, incentive units are in green, yellow is substantially developed. Some parcels have multiple colors for substantially and unsubstantially developed. The pink is the environmentally constrained land of the 200' riverfront buffer. These unit numbers are rounded to what could be built. If parcel 14-0 is removed from the proposal, the boundaries of the 40R would have to be updated with MRPC and DHCD and the spreadsheet would need to be modified. This would result in 752 units, which would be 2 units above the MBTA requirement. The Trust could also consider reducing density. It is important for the housing trust to bring the Town into safe harbor. It's important to be in compliance. The Town is very exposed outside of safe harbor with undesirable financial consequences. The district cannot go below a density of 20 units/acre and still meet 40R requirements. The LAHT would like to see the Town be in safe harbor with around 150 units. The MBTA legislation does not have an affordable requirement. The LAHT feels this could be a great opportunity to meet two goals at once with the 40R and the MBTA requirements.

Chairman Williston shares the density table provided on the 40R draft by-law. For the minimum as-of-right residential density at least 8-units/acre zoned for single-family residential use. Chairman Williston said he is confused where it says for single-family use. Chairman Petracca states the developer may apply for single-family units or homes as long as they meet the minimum density. This is from DHCD's template. Chairman Williston asks is the minimum density is 20 units/acre because they are zoning for multi-family? Chairman Petracca states this interpretation is correct and interestingly multi-family under DHCD is considered a 4-family and above. The density was initially 12 units and moved up to 15 units to meet the MBTA multi-family requirements.

Chairman Petracca states that the MBTA definition of multi-family may be prudent to find out. Chairman Williston states he believes the requirement is that there is a minimum of 15 units per acre, but a minimum of 15 is not required, but they are required to ALLOW up to 15 units/acre.

Chairman Petracca will look into the single-family allowance in 40R. Chairman Petracca states that the current total capacity numbers were viewed as too high and they have an opportunity to reduce the numbers without being required to hold a new public hearing. DHCD confirmed, per Chairman



Town of Lancaster  
Planning Board  
Lancaster, Massachusetts 01523  
Approved: March 28, 2022

Petracca, that the district may be reduced without a new hearing. Chairman Petracca asks the Board what number of capacity would the Planning Board find more favorable. If the Town is above 500 units it will receive \$600,000 and then \$3,000/unit constructed which totals one million fifty thousand dollars + for multi-family housing. Once the threshold goes below 500 the financial incentive payment from the state will be \$350,000.00, and will reduce as the units reduce. Chairman Petracca states the LAHT would like to be in safe harbor with their affordable units and would like to know what number of units the Board will entertain.

Chairman Williston states that the 150 units that would close the Towns SHI requirement would be fantastic and would resonate better. This would require 15-20 acres of 40R. The full incentive payment was for 501+ bonus units which would earn the \$600,000.00 zoning incentive payment is a lot of risk for the amount of incentive payment proposed. All of the units have the potential to be built and this is a large district. Chairman Williston believes removing the soccer field is a wise choice as we're still above the incentive payment requirement.

Member Mirabito asks about water capacity. The future zoned units must have the proper infrastructure. Member Mirabito looked at a 2018 Haley Ward document looking at water consumption of 62 GPD for 1.2 residents per unit. This was considered a conservative number. If 45% of units were one bedroom, 45% 2 bedroom, 10% as one-bedroom the Haley Ward calculation was 18.4% of the 100 GPD. If the units go to 500 it is 61.4% of the total water for the entire development. If the units are proposed at 727 it would be 89.3% of the total water, and at 1129 units the water consumption would be 138.6% for the site would exhaust the water supply for the project. At 100 gallons per day and 1129 units it would be over 240% of the capacity. Member Mirabito reviews other numbers and ratio of water usage.

Chairman Petracca clarifies that the water is for the water coming into the site with Member Mirabito. This number is based on the water agreement with Leominster and a Haley and Ward study on water consumption in Lancaster from 2016. Chairman Petracca states that any project submitted to the Town for review must explain how they will provide water to the units. Currently this discussion is based on zoning and not bound by a water agreement with Leominster. Chairman Petracca states this isn't the phase they would determine the water usage for the project, but also industrial uses do not use a large amount of water. The discussion currently is on the 40R, not about the rest of the site at the moment. Member Mirabito states that for a district to receive final approval the Town must show the project will not have impacts on water, traffic, sewer, and must be approved by a public works official. Member Mirabito states 92.3% is utilized on site once the soccer field is removed from the project. Chairman Petracca states the water is not required for preliminary approval of the 40R District. The local DPW would not likely be involved because the agreement would be between the developer and Leominster. Chairman Petracca states they have the appropriate information for a preliminary approval. Member Mirabito states that sewer numbers follow the water numbers and since this is an overlay district the potential for industrial development in the area is likely. Chairman Williston echo's member Mirabito's concerns for the water requirements for the site since this district would have to be approved in the by-law and would have to show the Town can support the number of units proposed and is not sure how that would be possible. Member Jackson states she is also concerned with the water as well as the



Town of Lancaster  
Planning Board  
Lancaster, Massachusetts 01523  
Approved: March 28, 2022

sewage – even based solely on one-bedroom units. Member Jackson points out that Smart Growth practices should be followed for the site and currently there is nothing from Leominster regarding the water requirement.

Present before the Board: Frank Streeter

Mr. Streeter addresses Member Jackson and Member Mirabito's comments that the current proposed usage for the backland warehouse distribution center does not use a lot of water. There is no showering, washing vehicles, or large water uses on the site. Mr. Streeter feels the water agreement would be sufficient.

Present before the Board: Greg Jackson

Mr. Jackson states that you cannot assume that the water use for the industrial site will be low if you don't know what Use is going in the building. Mr. Jackson states 65 gallons per person per day is DEP recommendation. Mr. Jackson states that 65 gpd/person is a conservative number, and the number of bedrooms per unit must be taken into account as well. Mr. Jackson feels the water and sewer should be considered up front for the project. Chairman Williston states he doesn't want to speculate on how the water will be used or how DHCD calculates the requirement.

Member Jackson asks if there was a car wash proposed with the project. It was confirmed that there will be no car wash proposed with the project.

Chairman Petracca states that there is a possibility to dial the zone back substantially, but it will not meet MBTA requirements. The LAHT was attempting to meet two objectives at once, and lessening the project without considering MBTA is an option for a smaller 40R district. Chairman Petracca suggests having a discussion with DHCD and Director Farinacci on the water, sewer, and infrastructure requirements of the 40R application.

Present before the Board: Peter Christoph

Member Christoph thanks Member Mirabito for looking into the water concerns on the site.

Present Before the Board: Anne Ogilvie

Mrs. Ogilvie asked if at the hearing for the 40R how complete does the language have to be to submit, and Chairman Petracca stated some information should be detailed including the lots included, and given the changes being made to the proposal is the application being held back until the by-law is written and the questions about the infrastructure are answered and can residents discuss the changes prior to voting at Town Meeting. Mrs. Ogilvie points out that the potential of a 40B is being used as a threat for the 40R zone. Chairman Petracca states there is still plenty of opportunity for public comment but the application has been submitted per the Selectmen.

Present before the Board: Greg Jackson

Mr. Jackson states it is important to review the benefits and issues with the 40R and the 40B respectively and that the incentive payments for the 40R will be outweighed in costs to the Town. Mr. Jackson states he is under the impression that there are wetlands on the northern side above



Town of Lancaster  
Planning Board  
Lancaster, Massachusetts 01523  
Approved: March 28, 2022

the soccer fields but did not see that on the map and is wondering if the wetlands were delineated accurately on the map. Chairman Williston asks what type of environmentally constrained land is on the site. Chairman Petracca states that MRPC created the Map for LAHT and Chairman Petracca states she is sure that the map was checked for wetlands, but if wetlands are found through GIS she requests those be forwarded to the LAHT.

Present before the Board: Rob Zidek

Mr. Zidek states that he thought that DHCD will not receive public comment once they receive the application and he hopes that is not true as he has comments for the by-law regarding traffic. Mr. Zidek reads that a traffic report must be submitted to the Planning Board for review, but the LAHT has a committee appointed for review of the applications rather than the Planning Board. Chairman Petracca states that the Selectmen held a public hearing and public comment may be received before, the hearing has since been closed by the Selectmen and they are bound by the public hearing comment, however, anyone can send a comment to DHCD on their own it just wouldn't be under the public comment of the hearing. Chairman Petracca states she is not sure what DHCD will do with the comments, but they may be submitted. Discussion ensues regarding public comment. Chairman Petracca requests that the LAHT be cc'd on comments to DHCD so they can stay informed.

**4. Review "MBTA Communities" Multi-Family Housing District Requirement**

Review any new information available at meeting time. (Continued from 1/24/2022)

Present before the Board: Victoria Petracca, Lancaster Affordable Housing Trust (LAHT)

Chairman Williston states it would be beneficial for Chairman Petracca and Director Farinacci to speak to DHCD to ensure the 40R proposal does in fact meet MTBA guidelines. Chairman Williston shares the draft MBTA regulations. The draft regulations state that the requirements for a determination of a reasonable size metrics must provide 50 acres in total including one parcel of at least 30 contiguous acres. A description of the water and wastewater serving the district and whether that is sufficient to serve the district is concerning that by 2024 there still may not be water or sewer service for the area and we do not know what will be required of us to show at that time. Chairman Williston asks Chairman Petracca if she has looked into this. Chairman Petracca states she attended the Mass Municipal Association webinar and Chris Klutchman of DHCD was asked multiple questions on infrastructure, capacity of water and wastewater, and Chris Klutchman made it very clear that this was a zoning initiative and they were not seeking evidence of the infrastructure being in place and they would expect that to come in with the developer and an approved project. The frequently asked questions on the DHCD website is consistently being updated. There is an MBTA family roadshow as well that they're adding the Q&A to. Chairman Petracca states that this would have to go to town meeting for the district to pass, even if it is approved. Chairman Williston states they either have to submit a multi-family zone that complies or an action plan by the end of the year. There are no limits or restrictions on the size of the units, there are no existing units on the



Town of Lancaster  
Planning Board  
Lancaster, Massachusetts 01523  
Approved: March 28, 2022

proposed site, the required minimum density is met on the proposed site, 7B is a description of any known physical or regulatory requirements that would restrict the number of units in the district. Would the current MOA being discussed create restrictions for the site? Chairman Petracca states the MOA will not restrict the site. Chairman Williston states that it seems they don't want environmentally constrained acreage included in the acreage total. Member Mirabito discusses the unit requirement from MBTA and feels that they may be flexible on the requirement of 750 units. Chairman Williston shows a list of all MBTA communities – from their website – and Plympton has 1,068 housing units in their town and they're being required to construct 750 new housing units. This is an MBTA adjacent community with no stops in their town and they are the most impacted community by this new requirement. Lancaster would need to provide 279 units in our multi-family district if it was 10% of the housing stock, but we are being required to provide 750 units. Chairman Williston states he would like to draft a comment to MBTA in regard to this.

Member Jackson agrees that there should be a way to reduce the size of the district and wonders if Director Farinacci was able to garner more information on the 750-unit requirement. If the reasonable size can be reduced, then the quantity of units should be able to be reduced as well. Director Farinacci states that she has been in touch with DHCD, and the 750-unit requirement is not up for debate. DHCD stated that once towns were beneath a certain number of units, they based it on acreage of the Town and they will likely not reduce the 750-unit requirement. Chairman Williston said rounding it in that way will be devastating for some communities.

Chairman Petracca states she can confirm what Director Farinacci said, that the 750-unit requirement is firm and not flexible and the town should think of how they can meet this. DHCD has shared information on the housing shortage and what's happening in the rest of the country and there is a link between housing and economic development in Massachusetts. Chairman Petracca states whether we agree or not it is a requirement and we do have to figure out how to comply. The burden placed on smaller communities is much larger than the burden being placed on larger communities and Chairman Williston feels all the MBTA adjacent towns should come together and voice their concerns.

Chairman Petracca states this initiative is also linked to climate policy by working on transit-oriented approach by attempting to preserve open space and still meet housing goals.

Member before the Board:      Dick Trussel, 15 Burbank

Mr. Trussel states that the MBTA and 40R requirements are separate, and adding the soccer field back to the 40R the Town would meet the 40R and MBTA requirements at once. Once the 150 units of the 40R are built it is also 150 units for the MBTA so it qualifies in both instances. With one effort you accomplish three goals, by also getting the Town into safe harbor. Mr. Trussel states we should think of these together and not separate. Mr. Trussel states the 40R will bring businesses and help with the tax base. Mr. Trussel states there is a potential problem exists with the water supply with the 750 units but it is not known for certain.

Chairman Williston states the final determination for the 40R and the MBTA requirements state that the Town must show we can support the units. Mr. Trussel states we do not have to show we are providing it for all units, just for the 150 units. Chairman Williston states the 40R requirement is that



Town of Lancaster  
Planning Board  
Lancaster, Massachusetts 01523  
Approved: March 28, 2022

they show they can support the future units. Mr. Trussel states there is an assumption that the water supply cannot be increased and we do not know for certain. Mr. Trussel states every time something is removed from the 40R district it goes back to the jurisdiction of the Planning Board. Mr. Trussel states 150 units puts the town into safe harbor and brings income and does not understand the arguments against the project.

Present before the Board: Rob Zidek

Mr. Zidek states that there will be some state legislatures in Lancaster soon and this may be a good thing to bring up to them. Mr. Zidek sees the benefit of the MBTA but doesn't feel that 750 units is beneficial for Lancaster. Mr. Zidek hopes there is a way they could reach a more reasonable number of units.

Director Farinacci states she would like to meet with DHCD and Victoria Petracca and have the meeting recorded. Chairman Williston feels this would be a helpful conversation. Chairman Petracca asked if we could also discuss the zoning table and Director Farinacci confirms that would be amenable.

**5. Proposed Amendments to the Lancaster Zoning Bylaws Article XVII: Solar Energy Systems**

Zero Point has drafted some suggested bylaw amendments that they'd like the Planning Board to propose on their behalf at the Annual Town Meeting in May. The board will discuss and review any feedback received from other town offices by meeting time.  
(Continued from 1/24/2022)

The Board did not receive any feedback on this from Town Counsel, the Fire Department, or other departments yet at this time. Chairman Williston did ask Mr. Corbett if he had pictures of these batteries on other sites as well as the fire prevention measures they've prepared for other towns and has shared this information with the Board. Chairman Williston anticipates this being on the next meeting.

Member Jackson asks if they should be speaking with engineers or other professionals about the batteries exploding as it's been an issue in other countries. Chairman Williston states he was hoping the Fire Chief would have more input on this as he is not sure who else to speak to in order to garner this information.

Present before the Board: Dick Trussel

Mr. Trussel asks how the Town benefits from having the solar batteries in the Town; Will these batteries only be there for the life of the solar permit and will the owner of the land be paid a rental by the solar company; Is the Town intending to treat this as more solar coming into the Town and what would the removal plan be compared to the solar schedule. Chairman Williston states there is a decommissioning provision for 20 years proposed in the draft by-law. Mr. Trussel asks if the





Town of Lancaster  
Planning Board  
Lancaster, Massachusetts 01523  
Approved: March 28, 2022

battery will be decommissioned at the same time as the solar field. Chairman Williston states that may be determined in the decommissioning agreement.

Member Christopher states that he agrees the decommissioning is very important and that they may not run with the solar facilities decommissioning. Member Christopher states that if this falls under utility work it may be granted certain exemptions. Member Christopher states if these are free-standing locations they should be treated as a free-standing facility and must pay all associated construction and permitting fees for the project as well as associated taxes. Mr. Christopher states they need to understand there will be a lot of overhead utilities in association with this project. Solar is the future of the power grid but he is unsure how batteries play into this industry. We have aging infrastructure in the northeast and many conduits are not large enough to handle their electrical needs and the need for batteries will become more prevalent in the coming years.

Chairman Williston states he will send another e-mail to Mr. Corbett and see if he can send any information on how these structures are taxed.

Member Jackson states she agrees with Mr. Trussel and Member Christopher and if these batteries will be attached to the solar fields then the decommissioning should be reflective of that relationship. Chairman Williston believes the decommissioning for solar fields does include any battery storage associated.

Present before the Board;       Greg Jackson

Mr. Jackson states it concerns him that the by-law proposed has been written by a developer that would benefit from it. It seems like Mr. Corbett did good work by basing this on another by-law, but can the Town hire their own consultant to review the benefits to the town. Chairman Williston will reach out to Tom Corbett and share this meeting with him.

**6. Review Violations and Active Orders:** Review and respond as appropriate to any new information received by meeting time and consider assessing fines where applicable for new or ongoing stormwater violations at:

201 Hilltop Road (Cease & Desist delivered, Stormwater Permit Application in progress)

2038 Lunenburg Road (Cease & Desist delivered, resolution in progress)

Member Christopher received pictures from Martha Moore showing turbidity in the pond and Member Christopher reached out to the engineer about if this is residual material coming from the Duval Road site since that site had a different soil type and he suspects there's a connection within the wetlands.

Present before the Board:   Martha Moore

Mrs. Moore states the person that notified her of the discharge into the pond also notified her that there is also standing water on Route 70 as well.



Town of Lancaster  
Planning Board  
Lancaster, Massachusetts 01523  
Approved: March 28, 2022

Old Union Turnpike, Assessors Map 3 Parcel 4 (Cease & Desist delivered, town counsel engaged)

Kopelman and Paige will be completing this cease and desist rather than the new Town Counsel Miyares-Harrington.

**7. Discuss Planning Board Articles for Annual Town Meeting**

Review the remaining meetings, schedule for completing articles and what the board would like to accomplish. Annual Town Meeting would typically be on 5/2/2022 this year.

Proposed bylaws under review include:

**a. Amendments to the Lancaster Zoning Bylaws Article XVII: Solar Energy Systems**

**b. Correction to Use Schedule, 220-8.4 A.**

Director Farinacci states that this has been sent to Town Counsel, and they are reviewing what has been sent to the Attorney General and will let the Town know if this will need to be a Town Meeting Article or if it could be approved as a scrivener's error.

**c. Stormwater Bylaw Amendments**

Member Mirabito states he feels this would be worthwhile to pursue with Member Christopher. Member Christopher states he agrees and that the general agreement was not to approve solar on a slope of greater than 5% which would solve a lot of issues they saw with previous sites. Also, net carbon lost to clear to install solar should be considered as well. Chairman Williston states his concern would be if we required engineering help between now and the proposed by-law.

**d. Agricultural Tourism and Farm Business Bylaw (New)**

(Continued from 1/24/2022)

Chairman Williston states this is something he would like to propose changes they could make to help agricultural uses in Town. Chairman Williston states they may want to consider approving a by-law to help farms in town. Chairman Williston found an agritourism by-law from another town which defined a farm and appropriate uses which was properties over 5 acres meeting a certain definition and allowed some uses on site, had some special permit uses allowed on the site. Chairman Williston states he had asked Director Farinacci if she could put something together for this purpose. Director Farinacci had taken a draft agritourism bylaw forwarded by Chairman Williston from another Town and pulled together other beneficial definitions and uses from other



Town of Lancaster  
Planning Board  
Lancaster, Massachusetts 01523  
Approved: March 28, 2022

states agritourism by-laws. Member Mirabito states that Kalon Farms was denied a permit for their outdoor events and uses and feels the Planning Board should work closely with the Board of Appeals to move forward with this. Chairman Williston said he pulled this agritourism bylaw from Northfield. Member Mirabito asks if they should include the Agricultural Council on this and Chairman Williston agrees that would be helpful. Member Christopher feels this could be beneficial and would give his input on the proposal. Chairman Williston states he will work with Director Farinacci for something to be prepared for next meeting. Director Farinacci states she will reach out to the Agricultural Commission on Uses they may want included in the by-law.

**8. Discuss and approve a Report for the “Proposed Amendment to Town of Lancaster Zoning Map” zoning article proposed by the Lancaster Select Board**

The board held a public hearing for this North Lancaster rezoning article on 1/18/2022. The chair intends to distribute a draft report to consider at this meeting. (Continued from 1/24/2022)

Chairman Williston states that Town Meeting has been delayed until March and this will likely be on the Annual Town Meeting. Chairman Williston states he will put together a report on the proposal.

**9. Correspondence**

**a. Any correspondence received by meeting time.**

Victoria Petracca reached out to Chairman Williston regarding the Harbor Hills project about adding the two SHI units to the Town’s inventory. Victoria Petracca had asked that the Board keep this in mind if the applicant comes back before the Board, which the Chairman doesn’t anticipate until the cease and desist is lifted. This is the first development submitted this way so there is no deadline to submit the SHI form. Chairman Williston recommends that as a condition of the next project like this they could include an amount of time that the SHI units must be added to the inventory.

**10. Vouchers**

**11. Review and Approve Minutes**

**a. Minutes for Planning Board Meeting on December 27, 2021 @ 7PM**

**MOTION: Motion made by Member Jackson to approve the minutes of December 27, 2021 with the amendments.**



Town of Lancaster  
Planning Board  
Lancaster, Massachusetts 01523  
Approved: March 28, 2022

**AMENDED MOTION:** Amended Motion made by Member Jackson and seconded by Member Christoph to approve the minutes of December 27, 2021 with the amendments.

**VOTE: (5-0-0)**

- b. Minutes for Planning Board Meeting on January 10, 2022 @ 7PM

**These minutes were not approved at this hearing.**

- c. Minutes for Planning Board meeting on January 18, 2022 @ 7PM

**These minutes were not approved at this hearing.**

- d. Minutes for Planning Board Meeting on January 24, 2022 @ 7PM

**12. Review Upcoming Meetings**

**2/14/2022 @ 7PM:** No meeting, Valentine's Day

**2/28/2022 @ 7PM**

**3/14/2022 @ 7PM**

**Adjourn**

**MOTION:** Motion made by Member Mirabito and seconded by Member Jackson to adjourn the public hearing.

**VOTE: (5-0-0)**