

Minutes of the Lexington Planning Board

Held on Wednesday, March 11, 2026, Virtual Meeting at 6:00 PM

Planning Board members present: Michael Schanbacher, Chair; Melanie Thompson, Vice-Chair; Tina McBride, Clerk; Robert Creech; Lin Jensen; and Michael Leon, associate board member.

Also present were: Abby McCabe, Planning Director and Aaron Koepper, Planner.

Michael Schanbacher, Chair of the Planning Board, called to order the meeting of the Lexington Planning Board on Wednesday, March 11, 2026 at 6:00 PM. For this meeting, the Planning Board is convening by video conference via Zoom. LexMedia is filming this meeting and is recording it for future viewing [here](#). The Chair explained the process and the procedure of the meeting.

Mr. Schanbacher welcomed Ms. Jensen to the Planning Board and congratulated Mr. Creech on his re-election. He then conducted a roll call to ensure all members of the Planning Board and members of staff present could hear and be heard.

Mr. Schanbacher provided a summary of instructions for members of the public in attendance. It was further noted that materials for this meeting are available on the Town's [Granicus Packet](#) dashboard. The Board will go through the agenda in order.

Development Administration

475 Bedford Street – Multi-Family Overlay Site Plan Review Public Hearing

Mr. Schanbacher opened the continued public hearing for a site plan review application at 475 Bedford Street. The applicant's team included: Essek Petrie of Pulte Homes of New England; Peter Mara and Dale Horsman, civil engineers from VHB; Erik Bednarek, landscape architect with VHB; and Clare McCaffrey, architect from Pulte Homes of New England. Also present was the Board's peer reviewer, Mike Carter from GCG Associates.

Mr. Petrie summarized the application history and the meetings thus far with the Planning Board, Town staff, and other committees. He also stated they have been working with the peer reviewer to revise plans. Mr. Petrie oriented the site with current conditions and highlighted the site challenges, notably significant utility easements and surrounding wetlands. He advised that they have filed a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the Conservation Commission (ConCom) and are progressing through that hearing process. In response to a request from the Conservation Commission, they will likely update the proposed lawn area to use a seed mix in open areas and wetland friendly shrubs. He further advised that there would be signage surrounding the wetlands between Building 3 and Drummer Boy Way to restrict access between the two developments and protect the wetlands. Mr. Petrie shared an overview of the plan updates including: the removal of 52 parking spaces, dedicating 3 parking spaces for public trail use, additional landscaping in the parking lot, revised unit mix counts for inclusionary units, and dedicated parking in the garage for the inclusionary units which will be offered at a discounted rate. The vehicle parking reduction allowed for a reconfiguration of bicycle parking in the garages to allow for oversized cargo bikes, EV charging, and a bicycle repair station in each garage. Mr. Petrie further shared that they are in discussions with the Affordable Housing Trust (AHT) to offer 3 inclusionary units available to households with lower incomes, hopefully at the 50% Area Median Income (AMI) rather than 80% AMI required in the zoning. The applicant has agreed to donate \$10,000 to the Transportation Demand Management fund and become a member of the 128 Business Council. Mr. Petrie shared renderings of the perspective from abutting neighbors at

Drummer Boy Way and Eldred Street. He described the modeling process and noted that landscape screening would be more robust for much of the year.

Mr. Mara provided more details on the parking reductions and revisions to stormwater and utility connections. He explained that the surface infiltration basins behind Building 1 were moved to increase setbacks and provide better maintenance access. Mr. Mara detailed revisions to the porous pavement including pretreatment water quality units and a filter course to improve water quality. He stated that they have revised stormwater calculations to reflect these changes and to address comments from the Peer Reviewer. Mr. Mara shared that the reduction in surface parking allowed small islands with shade trees to be dispersed throughout the lot and that snow storage areas had been added to the plans. He stated that short-term bicycle parking had been relocated closer to building entrances and that there would be multiple wayfinding signs in the development to provide guidance for the buildings, garages, amenity spaces, public parking, and trail connection to Simond's Brook Trail. Mr. Mara concluded by advising that they are revising their photometric plan to reduce light poles to 12 feet, adding additional EV charging stations, and updating the tree mitigation plan per staff recommendations.

Mr. Bednarek presented revisions to the landscape plan and amenity spaces. He stated that they had increased plantings along Bedford Street to reinforce the Multi-Family Overlay (MFO) zoning district boundary. They would use a meadow mix of seeds for ground cover and added evergreen plantings for year-round screening and visual interest. Mr. Bednarek highlighted the addition of a fence around the half-court basketball court, an increase in playground size, and increased amenity space between Buildings 2 and 3. He further highlighted the additional shade trees proposed in the parking lot and around the basketball court and playground area, as well as decorative screening around the transformers and plantings in the detention pond areas. Mr. Bednarek detailed the tree removal and mitigation plan and confirmed compliance with Lexington's requirements.

Ms. McCaffrey presented the building layouts, highlighting building entrances, egress, and garage entry locations. She shared the garage floor plan including bicycle storage, a mail and package room, and a trash room. She stated that the roof has no occupiable space and would have screening over all mechanics. Ms. McCaffrey shared updated renderings of the façade. She noted that they included a mansard-style roof wrapping around the corners of the buildings to add character and minimize the visual scale of the buildings. She further detailed the use of varying windows and balconies, as well as articulations in the exterior wall to create depth and interest and to break up the massing.

Staff Comments

Ms. McCabe appreciated the collaboration with the AHT to offer three units at 50% AMI and highlighted the 2025 Inclusionary pricing on the unit. She summarized the staff memo from Mr. Koepper dated 3/9/26. She noted that they have eliminated the need for most waivers but are still requesting a waiver to allow a 2:1 slope near Building 3 instead of 3:1. This would eliminate the need for retaining walls in that area. She advised that staff had received revised plans and noted that the applicant is continuing to revise the plans to include additional oversized bicycle parking and 50% EV ready vehicle parking spaces. Ms. McCabe asked for a more detailed breakdown of the caliper inches of trees being removed and replaced; she recommended that the Town's general tree bylaw requirements be incorporated into the final landscape plan for the Board. Ms. McCabe noted that one sheet of the photometric plan referenced a taller light pole and asked for that to be corrected. Ms. McCabe summarized the ConCom meeting thus far, advising that the next hearing would be in April, and that they have requested any lawn areas near

the trail entrance be a meadow mix rather than manicured lawn. She stated that the Zoning Administrator confirmed the Average Natural Grade (ANG) sheet and that the building is in compliance.

Peer Reviewer's Comments

Mr. Carter stated that the applicant has addressed most items from their previous memo. He advised that the test pit in the porous pavement area shows a lower water table than other locations on the site. He recommended that a soil evaluator verify the water table during construction. Mr. Carter also noted that there is still pavement and an infiltration system proposed within the 100' wetlands buffer. He advised that it is unlikely that the applicant would be able to move or remove these, as there are restrictions on the utility easement areas and recommended that the applicant continue to work with the Conservation Commission. Mr. Carter noted that there are minor revisions recommended for the stormwater design but stated that most comments have been addressed.

Board Questions

Mr. Schanbacher reminded participants that Mr. Leon had been elevated to a voting member for this application prior to the March 2026 election; Ms. Jensen would not vote although she was welcome to ask questions and participate in the discussion.

Ms. Thompson appreciated the revisions, notably the addition of 2-bed inclusionary units and the partnership with the AHT to offer some units at a deeper discount. She questioned the reasoning behind offering 3 units at AMI 50% instead of rounding up to 23 inclusionary units. She requested a side-by-side comparison view of the exterior architectural changes to highlight the details.

Mr. Leon followed up on Ms. Thompson's façade remarks by recommending faux fenestration or substantial landscaping to screen the garage-level masonry wall, while noting that recent revisions helped reduce the buildings' boxy appearance. He questioned the placement of the sitting area along Bedford Street, suggesting that it may feel awkward for gatherings and could be better relocated. Mr. Petrie and Mr. Bednarek explained that the plaza is intended as an amenity for Building 1 and is designed with intentional landscape features and screening to create a more intimate and welcoming environment; Mr. Leon requested a more detailed visual for the next hearing. He further questioned whether the proposed amenities, including the playground, half basketball court, and courtyard, would be sufficient for families, suggesting additional features such as a perimeter walking path, enlarged plaza and play area, or a fenced dog area. Mr. Petrie and Mr. Bednarek explained that site constraints, including the 25-foot no-disturb Conservation buffer, utility easements, wetlands, and zoning requirements, limit these possibilities, though they may consider smaller additions like dog-waste stations. Mr. Leon also asked about snow storage locations, which were clarified by Mr. Mara, and confirmed that tandem garage spaces would remain, though counted as single spaces.

Mr. Creech supported the inclusion of dog waste stations and appreciated the additional tree plantings on site. He confirmed that the inclusionary units at 50% AMI would be affordable in perpetuity. He asked for details about trash removal, trash chute locations, and composting options. Mr. Petrie advised that there will be chutes on every floor, the dumpsters will be removed by private service when full, and that they could not commit to composting as it had not been successful at other projects and attracted rodents and pests. Mr. Creech stated that the mansard details were attractive and questioned the materials planned for siding, expressing his preference for low-maintenance, durable material. Mr. Creech reviewed the renderings of the abutters' views, confirmed the design process with Mr. Petrie, and noted

that the proposed building is much taller than the existing structures. He agreed with Mr. Leon and suggested that the plaza between Buildings 2 and 3 could be revised for better function.

Ms. McBride appreciated many revisions including the mansard roof details, mechanical screening, revised inclusionary unit mix, and lowered light pole heights. She encouraged color variation in the mansard roof and to round up the inclusionary units to 23. Ms. McBride asked for additional details on the roof runoff containment, treatment, and capacity. She suggested larger capacity units given the sensitivity of the site, its proximity to wetlands, and future water management needs. Mr. Mara explained the series of roof drains and restrictions on size and location of the detention systems. Ms. McBride asked where the bus would pick up school-aged children. Mr. Petrie advised that he would coordinate with the schools and suggested the front plaza area along Bedford Street could become a waiting area. Ms. McBride stated the benefits of composting including fewer trash pickups and emphasized Lexington's support of State goals to reduce organic waste. She further recommended that the inclusionary 3-bedroom units be moved away from the lobbies on each floor.

Ms. Jensen echoed the request to round up the inclusionary units and to include composting options. She cited ways in which the Applicant could eliminate or minimize composting odor and pest concerns. Ms. Jensen encouraged making the building solar-ready and considering solar canopies over the exterior parking lot. She clarified the 25' no-build and 50' no-structure buffers around the wetland areas dictated by ConCom. Mr. Petrie advised that Building 3 is partially in the 25-50' buffer, which was permitted by ConCom as the proposed structure and wetland recreation is an improvement over the existing conditions. Ms. Jensen confirmed that the size of the proposed amenity space meets requirements, that DPW and Engineering confirmed sufficient water supply and utility capacity, and the boundaries of the porous pavement vs. traditional asphalt. Discussed with Ms. McCabe and Mr. Leon whether the oversized spaces in the garage would be counted as one or two in parking calculations. Ms. McCabe advised that the Applicant is meeting parking requirements without the tandem spaces, so they do not need a special permit. Mr. Petrie and Mr. Horsman suggested the spaces could be used for extra storage. Ms. Jensen suggested prohibiting double parking or limiting the maximum number of cars allowed in the garage. She asked the Applicant to consider electric grills instead of propane. Ms. Jensen requested the site coverage and net floor area calculations and encouraged the Applicant to align with 2025 Zoning Bylaws although she noted they are allowed to follow 2024 Zoning Bylaws due to their zoning freeze completed last year.

Mr. Schanbacher clarified the dimensions of the plaza between buildings 2 and 3. Mr. Petrie advised that the size had not changed, just the programming of the space. Mr. Schanbacher wondered if they would tow cars if the 3 public parking spaces for trail access were occupied. Mr. Petrie stated that they do not typically monitor the surface lot unless it becomes a significant issue for residential parking availability.

Public Comments

Elizabeth Piquet, 31 Fifer Lane, requested a fence prohibiting trespass to Drummer Boy Way and additional renderings of the view from 1-12 Drummer Boy Way. She suggested a view from Ivan Street would be more beneficial than Eldred St. Ms. Piquet echoed the suggestion of composting.

Ziahao Li, 415 Marrett Road, asked if the hearing for 419 Marrett Road would take place during this meeting and asked how to share comments with the Board.

Lisa Newton, 15 Ledge lawn Avenue, Precinct 8 Town Meeting member, appreciated the applicant working with the Affordable Housing Trust and wondered who would provide the funding. She encouraged the

Applicant to round up on inclusionary units and to reexamine the amount and location of the open space provided.

Nancy Sofen, 3 Abernathy Road, Tree Committee, expressed concern with the salt intolerance of the proposed parking lot trees and recommended other species such as a Hawthorn that could better meet their needs.

Krista Lane, 59 Fifer Lane, echoed Ms. Piquet's request for additional views from Drummer Boy Way. She supported Mr. Creech's siding requests and the request for inclusion of a dog area.

Doris Wong, 12 Drummer Boy Way, questioned why the views were not done from the Drummer Boy Way pool and design choices with the mansard roof. She asked for a unit size breakdown and encouraged the Applicant to connect with the schools as Drummer Boy Way has struggled with bus pickups.

Sudha Cheruku, 16 Calvin Street, expressed concerns with increased traffic from this development and others in the area.

Ziahao Li, 415 Marrett Road, again asked if the Board members were going to get to the hearing for 419 Marrett Road this evening.

Vida Baterina Hom, 175 Grove Street, reiterated her suggestions from her letter dated 3/10/26 particularly regarding sewer tie-ins and a review of the foundation and water tables.

Bob Pressman, 22 Locust Avenue, suggested the play area was too small for the development and wondered about the sizes of the 50% AMI units proposed.

Jay Luker, 26 Rindge Avenue, Precinct 1 Town Meeting member, appreciated the parking reduction and wondered how many spaces were "lost" by counting the tandem spaces as one instead of 2. He suggested that it would be beneficial to compare parking data across developments.

Board Comments

Mr. Creech shared visuals that he created highlighting the distance and elevation changes between Drummer Boy Way and the proposed buildings. He asked the Applicant to provide more details at the next meeting.

Ms. Jensen agreed with Ms. Sofen's comments regarding salt tolerance and urged the Applicant to consider the wetlands when selecting a snow management and treatment plan. She echoed traffic concerns and suggested a larger study of the area, inclusive of all proposed and existing units. She wondered what reinforcements were in place to accommodate the weight of the buildings on the wetlands.

Ms. McBride suggested that solar panels could provide acoustic screening for the roof-top mechanicals.

Mr. Schanbacher expressed his disappointment with the inclusionary units, noting that 22 units, while meeting the regulations and bylaws, is only 14.7%. He appreciated their ongoing work with the Affordable Housing Trust to provide deeper discounted units. He also expressed his displeasure with the design and suggested continued revisions to the design and façade treatments. He supported Conservation's request for meadow mix and appreciated the progress the Applicant had made.

Ms. Thompson moved to continue the site plan review public hearing for 475 Bedford Street to Tuesday, April 7th, at or after 6 p.m. on Zoom. Ms. McBride seconded the motion. The Planning Board voted in favor of the motion 5-0-0 (Roll call: Leon – yes; Thompson – yes; Creech – yes; McBride – yes; Schanbacher – yes). MOTION PASSED.

The Board recessed from 8:36 PM to 8:41 PM

419 Marrett Road – Village Overlay Site Plan Review Public Hearing

Mr. Schanbacher opened the public hearing for a Village Overlay Site Plan Review application at 419 Marrett Road. The applicant’s team included: Ben Finnegan of Finnegan Development; Mike Novak, civil engineer with Patriot Engineering; Richard Martz, architect with JSA Design; Jeff Thoma, landscape architect of J Thoma Land Design Studios; and Frederick Gilgun, attorney with Nicholson, Sreter, and Gilgun. Also present was the Planning Board’s peer reviewer, Robert DiBenedetto of Hancock Associates.

Mr. Finnegan summarized the proposal for a 9-unit condo building with garage parking below. He stated that all units would be 2-bedroom and ADA adaptable and that the building would be Passive House certified. He noted that the building would have a similar design and finish as his project at 93 Bedford Street, which has been in high demand by future owners.

Mr. Novak shared the current site layout and advised that the house and garage currently improving the property would be removed prior to any site work¹. He advised that the driveway would be shifted slightly to improve sight lines and provide distance from the Spring Street/Marrett Road intersection. Mr. Novak shared drainage and utility plans. He stated that soil testing had been conducted and that he revised data would be prepared for the next meeting. He further stated that the Fire Department had confirmed their truck turnaround proposal. Mr. Novak noted that Marrett Road is a state road and will require additional permits.

Mr. Thoma explained vehicle and bicycle circulation on site, highlighting the van accessible parking and the covered entrance to the building lobby from the surface lot. He noted that the short-term bicycle parking would be moved closer to the lobby entrance. The Applicant is proposing to retain the existing arborvitae and retaining walls, supplemented by a robust planting plan with shade trees and a mix of evergreen and deciduous shrubs, along with a 6-foot fence for noise and light screening and privacy. For the next meeting, Mr. Thoma advised that plans will be updated with 12’ light poles, snow storage areas, and a comprehensive tree mitigation plan including caliper inches removed and replaced.

Mr. Martz presented the proposed building, which would be 3 stories and 40’ tall with shiplap aluminum siding and a stone façade along the base. He advised that the mechanical unit location and screening has not been finalized yet. The building is proposed to be a flat roof building with internal drainage. The roof will be solar ready. Mr. Martz shared floor plans of the garage and residential units, highlighting bicycle parking areas, the trash room, and private residential storage areas.

Staff Comments

Ms. McCabe summarized the staff memo from Mr. Koepper dated March 4, 2026 and confirmed that the Applicant is addressing the requested revisions. She noted that the revisions relate to bicycle parking requirements and planting information. Ms. McCabe advised that the Applicant had received a zoning freeze prior to the revisions to the Village Overlay District zoning bylaws and would be reviewed under

¹ Property owner secured necessary approval and permits from the Historical Commission and the Zoning Board of Appeals to relocate the historic house to 451 Marrett Road.

2024 zoning requirements. She further advised that the property owner had received approval from the Zoning Board of Appeals and the Historical Commission to relocate the historic portion of the existing house.

Planning Board's hired Peer Review Consultant's Comments

Mr. DiBenedetto from Hancock Associates advised that the proposed plan set and stormwater report are largely compliance with Lexington and Massachusetts regulations. He noted that outstanding items include clarification on structure dimensions and documentation to verify and are not major obstacles. Mr. DiBenedetto stated that the stormwater design is capable of capturing and infiltrating all on-site and some off-site stormwater, although he requested additional details for the off-site flows.

Public Comments

Nancy Sofen, 3 Abernathy Road, Tree Committee, noted that the tree bylaw does not apply to the removal of the existing house. She wondered what protections would be in place for existing trees during that process.

Board Questions

Ms. Thompson expressed disappointment that no inclusionary unit was provided. She suggested increasing the unit count to 10 by redistributing the unit sizes in order to include an affordable unit. She further expressed disappointment with the boxy, flat-roof design. Mr. Schanbacher supported Ms. Thompson's suggestion to split one unit into two smaller 1-bedroom units in order to include an inclusionary unit. Mr. Finnegan advised that it was not financially feasible based on his calculations and the market demand for 2-bedroom units.

Mr. Leon echoed comments about the design and expressed his hope for a more creative architectural approach. He also agreed with Mr. Schanbacher and Ms. Thompson about the inclusionary unit. He questioned the location of the driveway and urged the Applicant to confirm the distance from lot lines and the intersection for safety. Mr. Leon suggested it was unusual to have the front entrance on the site and recommended altering the pedestrian path to Marrett Road. He clarified that the residential amenity space is private balconies and terraces. He suggested a small play area for future tenants.

Ms. McBride expressed displeasure with the plans for the historic house, although she noted that it is not under Planning Board purview. She agreed with the other Board members about the inclusionary unit and noted that the parking ratio seems high for the development's needs. She wondered if rainwater would be collected for on-site use. Mr. Martz stated that they would consider it.

Mr. Creech wondered why the siding material was chosen. He expressed his preference for a non-vinyl siding. Mr. Creech appreciated the size of the units noting their maneuverability but also echoed previous comments that smaller units would also be appreciated. He suggested the in lieu of an inclusionary unit, the Applicant could make a donation to the Affordable Housing Trust. Mr. Creech further suggested a special permit for a taller fence and the inclusion of a bus shelter on Marrett Road.

Ms. Jensen supported the idea of smaller units and an inclusionary unit. She also expressed disappointment with historic house plans. Ms. Jensen confirmed that the landscape buffer and setback requirements had been met. She expressed her appreciation of the sustainability measures already proposed and questioned the materials for the parking lot and drive aisles. Mr. Thoma and Mr. Novak clarified that only the drive aisles are non-porous pavement. Ms. Jensen encouraged clear signage for the

driveway entrance and exit and confirmed that all items in the staff and peer review memos would be addressed. She requested confirmation that 40% of the roof would be solar-ready.

Mr. Schanbacher questioned the proposed price for the units, the materials in the façade adjacent to the garage, and single-stair egress requirements. He suggested design revisions including reference to the historic house style and proportions. He noted that the building comes within 0.25” of the allowed height and recommended revisions to allow for more variance during construction. Mr. Schanbacher repeated his support of two smaller units with one being affordable.

Public Comments

Elaine Tung, 5 Franklin Road, Chair Affordable Housing Trust, stated that she would contact Mr. Finnegan about opportunities for an inclusionary unit in this proposal.

Ms. Thompson moved to continue the site plan review public hearing for 419 Marrett Road to the Planning Board meeting on Tuesday, April 28th, at or after 6 p.m. on Zoom. Ms. McBride seconded the motion. The Planning Board voted in favor of the motion 5-0-0 (Roll call: Creech – yes; Jensen – yes; Thompson – yes; McBride – yes; Schanbacher – yes). MOTION PASSED.

3-4-5 Militia Drive – Approval Not Required (ANR) Plan

Ms. McCabe explained that the ANR is intended to combine the lots for 3, 4, and 5 Militia Drive as was a condition of approval from their site plan review for a mixed-use multi-family development approved in 2025. She stated that staff recommend approval and that the Board would need to come to the Planning Office to sign the plans.

There were no Board or public comments on this item.

Ms. Thompson moved to approve and sign the ANR plan for 3, 4, and 5 Militia Drive. Ms. McBride seconded the motion. The Planning Board voted in favor of the motion 5-0-0 (Roll call: Thompson – yes; Creech – yes; Jensen – yes; McBride – yes; Schanbacher – yes). MOTION PASSED.

Board Administration

Board Member & Staff Updates

The Board discussed parking requirements and traffic studies in the larger projects and the boundaries of the Planning Board’s purview.

Ms. McCabe reminded the Board that the Citizen Planning Training Collaborative conference is on March 21 and to contact her if they would like to attend. She shared a draft schedule for May and June meetings dates and asked the Board to confirm their availability.

Mr. Leon suggested the Board review surrounding communities on how they regulate inclusionary housing requirements and architectural design standards because these comments have been repeated at many meetings for many projects. Mr. Schanbacher cautioned against being too prescriptive with design requirements and noted the economic constraints on construction. Ms. Jensen asked about the role of the Design Advisory Committee.

Upcoming Meetings: 3/25, Tuesday 4/7, and Tuesday 4/28.

Adjournment

Ms. Thompson moved that the Planning Board adjourn the meeting of Wednesday March 11, 2026 at 10:21 PM. Ms. McBride seconded the motion. The Planning Board voted in favor of the motion 5-0-0 (Roll call: Creech – yes; Thompson – yes; Jensen – yes; McBride – yes; Schanbacher – yes). MOTION PASSED

Meeting adjourned at 10:21 PM. [Lex Media](#) recorded the meeting.

Material from the meeting can be found in the Planning Board's [Granicus Packet](#).

List of Documents

1. 475 Bedford Street available: <https://lexingtonma.portal.opengov.com/records/114092>
PDF File titled "Bedford-Hartwell-Transportation Info_3.11.2026 Meeting"
AFU Layout, Waiver Request, Revised Stormwater Report, Revised Site Plan Review Planset, Notice of License
Garage Plan, Lighting details, Revised Architectural Plans
Response to Staff Comments March 2, 2026
Response to Abutters Comments March 2, 2026
Response to Peer Review
GCG Associates Peer Review Memo, dated 3/6/26
Staff Memo 2 – 475 Bedford St, dated 3/10/26
Public Comment letters: Design Advisory Committee January 26, 2026, Dotty T sent January 21, 2026, Greenway Corridor Committee Letter March 2, 2026, Klane January 26, 2026, Lexington Bicycle Advisory Committee Letter March 5, 2025, Human Rights Committee Letter, Transportation Advisory Committee Letter January 13, 2026
2. 419 Marrett Road material available: <https://lexingtonma.portal.opengov.com/records/115833>
Civil Plan set dated January 26, 2026, DRT response to comments, Renderings 2, Sustainability Narrative, Project Narrative, Accessibility Narrative, Architectural Plans, Construction Management Plan, Section 9 and 12 Checklist, Abutter Meeting Summary, Zoning Narrative, Stormwater Report
Staff Memo 1 – 419 Marrett Rd, dated 3/4/26
Hancock Review Memo 1 2026-03-05, dated 3/5/26
Public comments: Design Advisory Committee, Lexington Bicycle Advisory Committee, Transportation Advisory Committee
3. 3-4-5 Militia Drive material available: <https://lexingtonma.portal.opengov.com/records/117786>
ANR Plan_3-4-5_Malitia_Dr_Lexington
Cover_Letter__Wed_Mar_4_2026_at_09-48-31
Owner authorizatin