

**Adopted Meeting Minutes
June 20, 2017 Planning Board Meeting
7:00 P.M. | Engineering Conference Room, Woburn City Hall**

Chair Carolyn Turner called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and asked City Planner/Grant Writer Dan Orr to call the roll.

ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Mr. Kevin Donovan, Mr. Bob Doherty, Mr. Jim Callahan, Mr. Michael Ventresca, Mr. Dave Edmonds, Ms. Claudia Bolgen and Chair Carolyn Turner were present. Also present were Planning Director Tina Cassidy, City Planner/Grant Writer Dan Orr, and City Planner Karen Smith.

Chair Carolyn Turner inquired to Planning Director Cassidy about any ANR applications before the Board this evening. Planning Director Cassidy stated that there were two.

92 WALTHAM STREET ANR (DIANE KRAUSE)

Planning Director Cassidy provided an overview of the ANR application and stated that the lot size calculations noted at last month's meeting have since been corrected. Accordingly, she recommended the Board endorse the plan.

Motion to endorse the submitted ANR plan as one not requiring approval under the Subdivision Control Law, made by Mr. Dave Edmonds;
Seconded by Mr. Bob Doherty;
Motion carried, 7-0-0.

124-130 LEXINGTON STREET ANR (JOHN D. MAROTTO)

Planning Director Cassidy provided an overview of the plan and recommended endorsement of the plan as one not requiring approval under the Subdivision Control Law.

Motion to endorse the submitted ANR plan as one not requiring approval under the Subdivision Control Law, made by Mr. Dave Edmonds;
Seconded by Mr. Bob Doherty;
Motion carried, 7-0-0.

PUBLIC HEARING: ZONING AMENDMENT RELATIVE TO DEFINITION OF "MIXED USE HOTEL/RESTAURANT" (MADISON WOBURN HOLDINGS, LLC)

Attorney Joseph Tarby, Murtha Cullina, 600 Unicorn Park Drive, approached the Board on behalf of the Petitioner and stated the applicant is requesting an amendment to the definition of the term "mixed use hotel/restaurant" in Section 2 of the Zoning Ordinance. The amendment would add the phrase "or other permitted uses" to the definition.

Attorney Tarby provided an overview of the current and envisioned uses on the development site and background on the City Council's approval relative to the original special permit and prior zoning amendment. Previously the City added the definition of "Mixed-use Hotel/Restaurant" in order to

accommodate the developer's initial redevelopment plan. In particular, the change allowed for an increase in the number of restaurant establishments that could be permitted on the site.

Attorney Tarby stated that the proposed amendment is similar in wording to that of "Mixed-use Retail," which incorporates the phrase "or other permitted uses." In addition, the uses that would be allowed as a result of the proposed amendment would be limited to those of the Office Park (O-P) District and would still be subject to City Council Special Permit under the "Mixed-Use Hotel/Restaurant" classification. Overall, the proposed zoning amendment is intended to provide more flexibility in terms of leasing to the applicant because he is having a difficult time finding a third restaurant lessee willing to tenant the approved space. One such alternative is an urgent care operator.

Mr. Denis Dowdle, of Woburn Madison Holdings, 20 Park Plaza #433, Boston, MA, approached the Board.

Attorney Tarby offered to provide a conceptual rendering of the front elevation for the mixed-use hotel structure to the Board.

Motion to accept the Petitioner's handout made by Mr. Dave Edmonds;
Seconded by Ms. Claudia Bolgen;
Motion carried, 7-0-0.

Attorney Tarby offered to provide the existing conceptual site Plan of Record to the Board, as approved during the special permit process.

Motion to accept the Petitioner's handout made by Mr. Dave Edmonds;
Seconded by Mr. Bob Doherty;
Motion carried, 7-0-0.

Mr. Dave Edmonds inquired about the presence of more than one business on the proposed retail pad that would replace the third restaurant. He is concerned that the proposal would not reflect the original intent of the previous zoning amendment as it would result in three additional businesses on the site that were not envisioned as part of the development.

Mr. Denis Dowdle confirmed that the proposal does intend to add three additional businesses to the site, but reiterated that those businesses would be permitted only by special permit from the City Council and that in the overall scheme of the development, the change is minor.

Ms. Claudia Bolgen stated that the "vision" for the earlier development was clear: a combination of hotels and restaurants created a "stay and dine" vision. Now, that original vision for the site seems unclear, particularly with the possibility of incorporating a medical facility. She asked why an urgent care facility is envisioned as a tenant particularly when the site is so close to another urgent care facility site just recently permitted on Washington Street just north of this site. She is having difficulty envisioning what the purpose of the development is from a community planning perspective.

Mr. Denis Dowdle stated that they do envision a small, lunch-based restaurant here, as opposed to a large, full-service restaurant. They still think of it of having a food offering, as well as a medical service where there is a void in the market. In addition, an urgent care facility generates less traffic than a restaurant of the same size.

Attorney Tarby stated that in contrast to the urgent care facility on Washington Street that was just recently permitted on the other side of the bridge across Route 128, this facility will offer services to the adjacent businesses.

Ms. Claudia Bolgen inquired about what would be envisioned for remaining retail space excluding the urgent care facility. Mr. Dowdle responded that it could be a coffee shop or another niche type business.

Ms. Claudia Bolgen inquired about what is permitted under the current zoning to get a sense of potential tenants in the future. Attorney Tarby responded with a clarification of the other permitted uses in the O-P district, which included child care establishments, gymnasiums, ATM's, banks, office and research and testing space.

Ms. Claudia Bolgen stated that she is taking into consideration the demands of the market as well as what is desirable from a planning perspective in terms of impacts to the city at-large.

Mr. Denis Dowdle stated that, from a planning perspective, the City has decided to zone the parcel O-P and this proposal simply expand allowable uses on the parcel already permitted within that district.

Ms. Claudia Bolgen stated that she understands that perspective and the intentions of the developer and that she is evaluating the merits of this individual proposal. However, she is not sure that this is the best approach from a planning perspective. In addition, she does not believe that this kind of development approach has been taken in communities surrounding Woburn.

Attorney Tarby stated that the only thing that deviates from the initial proposal is the retail component in one portion of the development.

Mr. Denis Dowdle stated that he does not believe that this concept is a huge departure from the initial proposal. It is a small tweak in order to address a changing retail market.

Mr. Dave Edmonds inquired about the impact that this would have on the City as a whole, as it does not appear to be as small of a change as it is being presented. It would affect eight different zoning districts not just O-P. Planning Director Cassidy responded that she would not be able to adequately assess the City-wide impact without significant background research.

Planning Director Cassidy further stated that the addition of "other uses as permitted" wording would potentially unlock many other parcels to permit Mixed Use Hotel/Restaurant uses where they are not allowed today, by virtue of the mix of uses.

Mr. Michael Ventresca stated that he is concerned with the potential for adding extra traffic to the site given the amount of activity that is already present.

Mr. Denis Dowdle stated that what is proposed would not be as impactful as the previous setup relative to traffic. Planning Director Cassidy stated that it is not at all a certainty that traffic would be less impactful under the new proposal; it would be dependent upon on the tenancy and the time of day. A Starbucks coffee shop or popular gym would add traffic to Woburn roads in the morning that would not be added with a full-service restaurant open for dinner.

Chair Carolyn Turner stated that she is concerned with the open-endedness of the zoning definition and what could be permitted in other parts of the city. Attorney Tarby responded that this concern may be able to be addressed by incorporating additional amendment wording that limits the “other uses as permitted” to a specific zoning district.

Mr. Bob Doherty stated that in this situation, the plan the developer brought to the City in the past is not working and is seeking a new zoning change because the earlier plan does not work as a business model. This is not what the Board is here for.

Mr. Denis Dowdle stated that the request made in this proposal is consistent with past proposed zoning amendments relative to mixed-use projects in the city.

Mr. Jim Callahan inquired about the intended construction timeline for the hotel and stated that it may be premature to bail out on the market for leasing to a restaurant.

Ms. Claudia Bolgen inquired about the need for a zoning amendment if the proposed new building were to house restaurants. Attorney Tarby responded that a zoning amendment would not be needed in that case.

Mr. Dave Edmonds stated that this proposal has been proposed too quickly and he would prefer to determine the impacts to the rest of the City prior to making a decision. Planning Director Cassidy responded that she would be willing to do some research but that it seems that it would be appropriate for the applicant to do some background research to present to the Board, as well.

Chair Carolyn Turner opened this matter for a public hearing and asked any members of the audience who would like to step forward to address the Board to please do so.

PUBLIC HEARING

Mr. Chris Owen, 3 Florence Terrace, stated that the Board should not take this zoning amendment proposal into consideration, particularly because the affected project was sold as a high-end mixed-use development and conference center and has not turned out as advertised. In addition, the landscaping plan has not been completed as required and promised traffic improvements have not yet been constructed/implemented.

Attorney Tarby stated that the traffic impacts have nothing to do with this zoning amendment proposal. Relative to landscaping, the plan has not been fully implemented due to pending roadway construction.

Mr. Chris Owen responded that, regardless of the road construction, more landscaping work could have been done outside of the affected area and that the traffic system that is to be constructed will not be sufficient for alleviating congestion.

Chair Carolyn Turner asked if any additional members of the audience would like to speak.

No one stepped forward.

Planning Director Cassidy stated that the Board has the option to take a vote or to continue the matter until the Board’s next meeting, pending additional information on the impact of the zoning change.

Ms. Claudia Bolgen inquired about the timeline of the City Council's hearings on this matter. Planning Director Cassidy stated that the Council's hearing on this matter also begins this evening, although it may be continued to their July 18th meeting.

Mr. Jim Callahan stated that he is in favor of a vote right now and would not be in favor of furthering the proposal.

Mr. Michael Ventresca stated that he believes the Board needs more time to consider the proposal and more information prior to making a decision.

Ms. Claudia Bolgen stated that the decision-maker here is the City Council and that the Board should be mindful of its purview. In addition, she is specifically curious about zones where retail is allowed with "other permitted uses" in addition to identifying the zones where this potential change in definition would have the greatest impact.

Mr. Robert Doherty stated that adopting the language of "other permitted uses" would allow the Petitioner to construct something other than a hotel and restaurants, and for that reason he is opposed, even if it is determined that the proposed zoning amendment has no other impact to other parcels across the city. He also stated that if the City approved this zoning change, the hotel might not be built at all.

Motion to close the public hearing made by Mr. Bob Doherty;
Seconded by Mr. Dave Edmonds;
Motion carried, 5-2, with Ms. Claudia Bolgen and Mr. Michael Ventresca opposed.

Motion to send an unfavorable recommendation on the proposed zoning amendment to the City Council,
Seconded by Mr. Dave Edmonds;
Motion carried, 5-2, with Ms. Claudia Bolgen and Mr. Michael Ventresca opposed.

PUBLIC HEARING: APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCTION MORE THAN ONE BUILDING ON A LOT FOR DWELLING PURPOSES AT 285, 287 AND 299 LEXINGTON STREET (FORMERLY SHANNON FARM) (SEAVER PROPERTIES LLC)

Mr. Michael Ventresca recused himself from participation in this matter.

Attorney Tarby approached the Board on behalf of the Petitioner and provided an overview of the Petition. The proposal is to construct 112 residential townhome units, includes at least 50% open space, and received City Council approval as of May 16, 2017.

Attorney Tarby further provided an overview of the memoranda received to date relative to the comments from various city departments on the project.

Mr. Mark Sleger, project engineer, approached the Board on behalf of the Petitioner to provide an overview of the site plan of the development including the proposed curb cuts, unit mix, parking, interior roadway layout, which includes "T" turnarounds and 24' roadway widths on most roads in order to accommodate emergency response vehicles and fire trucks.

Mr. Mark Sleger further stated that there are a total of 295 parking spaces onsite, well in excess of the requirement, which takes into consideration the interior garages.

Mr. Mark Sleger further stated that a trail will be provided from the development across the Open Space portion of the parcel into the existing trail network. The trail will be deeded to the Conservation Commission. 18 parking spaces have been provided for the purpose of public trail access.

Mr. Mark Sleger further stated that City Engineer Jay Corey is satisfied with the drainage conditions and modifications made in response to initial comments. Relative to the comments on behalf of the Public Works Director, they have been addressed in a revised plan that was not submitted to the Board.

Ms. Claudia Bolgen inquired as to why the revised plan has not been submitted to the Board. Mr. Mark Sleger responded that in the interest of consistency with the Council-approved version of the plan, the applicant chose to provide that version for distribution and Planning Board review.

Planning Director Cassidy explained that the applicant has to be careful to not make substantial changes to the Plan of Record that was approved by the Council. Only truly minor modifications are appropriate.

Mr. Scott Seaver, Petitioner, approached the Board. He stated that the Board has the complete plan package in front of them; the only difference between the modified version and the version submitted to the Board are minor wording changes, which have been specified in the Council's Order of Conditions.

Ms. Claudia Bolgen stated that she understands why the applicant submitted the package the way that it did, but some clarity is still needed for a comparison between the Plan of Record and the revised plan incorporating requirements of the Council's Decision.

Mr. Jim Callahan stated that it is the responsibility of the applicant to demonstrate what has changed.

Mr. Bob Doherty stated that it would seem that, without seeing the modified version of the plan, the Board must make an assumption that the applicant has incorporated all of the Council's conditions. Mr. Scott Seaver responded that there are only approximately 8 conditions that directly affect the drawings; his thought was to only provide the Plan of Record as to avoid confusion.

Ms. Claudia Bolgen stated for clarification that the City Council has completed the bulk of this application's review through its special permitting process and as such limits the purview of the Board. Planning Director Cassidy stated that this project is similar to other "more than one building on a lot for dwelling purposes" applications that the Board has review in the past and specified the Board's legal standard of review.

Ms. Claudia Bolgen inquired about the public access component and how that will be implemented and maintained. Attorney Tarby responded that the trail be implemented via public easement that must be adopted by the City and deeded to the Conservation Commission for maintenance, whereas the trailhead and parking lot maintenance will be the responsibility of the HOA.

Mr. Jim Callahan inquired about who in the City is responsible for ensuring that the conditions are adhered to when construction commences and post-construction. Planning Director Cassidy stated the Department of Inspectional Services is ultimately responsible for overseeing most of the conditions. However, there are numerous departments that are responsible for the building permit review process, which will also entail a review of conditions.

Mr. Jim Callahan inquired as to why the applicant has not provided the amended plan. Mr. Scott Seaver replied that the electronic version of the amended plan was provided to the Planning Office.

Planning Director Cassidy stated that it would have been preferable to have the developer submit hard copies of both plans, as it is not a practice of the Planning Office to print out large-scale copies on developers' behalves for dissemination.

Ms. Claudia Bolgen inquired the recordation process and signatory for the plans. Planning Director Cassidy stated because the City Council filing was a special permit filing, a plan does not get signed by the Council. However, the plan, including all sheets, are cited specifically in the Council's Decision document.

Attorney Tarby stated that the special permit is recorded with the Registry of Deeds but the plan itself is not. It is considered to be a condominium project with no individual lots.

Planning Director Cassidy asked for clarification on one of the ancillary driveways on the far right side of the property and its sufficiency to accommodate emergency vehicles, particularly with parking spaces included. Mark Sleger clarified that this space, like others, was designed with a template that is sufficient for emergency vehicle turnaround.

Planning Director Cassidy stated for the Board her primary concerns with the subdivision which include the width of the roadways. She advocates for 24'-wide roadways in all instances versus the current 20'-width proposed for several of the roadways. She also questioned whether the developer was providing appropriate trash storage, particularly for units that do not have a garage.

Mr. Bob Doherty inquired about why 24'-wide roads could not have been integrated throughout the plan for a better sense of safety given the amount of space that appears to be present. Mr. Mark Sleger stated that the site is tighter than it appears, given requirements for open space and building setbacks.

Mr. Scott Seaver that there are no Board of Health regulations to dictate trash storage; trash may be stored in a number of areas, as in any other single-family home scenario. There will be curbside pick-up. Of the entire project, there are only 12 stacked flats, and those have access either to basements or decks/utility rooms.

Chair Carolyn Turner opened this matter for a public hearing and asked any members of the audience who would like to step forward to address the Board to please do so.

PUBLIC HEARING

Mr. Michael Ventresca, 42 Dix Road Extension, approached the Board. He inquired about the existence of a landscaping plan and how it will be created. Mr. Scott Seaver stated that creation of a landscaping plan is included as a condition in the Council's Decision. There are some general

guidelines and a timeline by which the landscape plan needs to be submitted in concert with construction.

Mr. Michael Ventresca stated that he is also concerned with the impacts of more cars in the area, particularly headlights onto abutting properties. Mr. Scott Seaver responded that he would be willing to share a draft landscape plan with neighbors prior to submitting it formally to the City Council.

Motion to close the public hearing Mr. Dave Edmonds;
Seconded by Ms. Claudia Bolgen;
Motion carried, 6-0-0, with Mr. Michael Ventresca recusing.

Chair Carolyn Tuner asked if the Planning Director had a recommendation to share with the Board. Planning Director Cassidy responded that she would recommend approval, subject to requiring minimum roadway width of 24' for all roads in the project.

Motion to accept the Planning Director's recommendation made by Mr. Bob Doherty;
Seconded by Mr. Dave Edmonds, for discussion. Mr. Dave Edmonds asked for clarification regarding roadway width recommendation. Planning Director Cassidy responded with a clarification of her recommendation's impact on the current Plan of Record. It would have an extensive impact.

Mr. Jim Callahan inquired about the approval process and where the plan goes from here. Planning Director Cassidy responded that adopting the roadway width recommendation would fall under the purview of ensuring adequate ways of access to and from dwelling units. This would likely constitute a significant change to the plan and thus require Council approval of a modified Plan of Record.

Mr. Scott Seaver stated that adopting a recommendation to increase the roadway width to 24' will create dimensional issues. In addition, this plan has already been vetted by the Council and multiple departments over the course of several months.

Attorney Tarby stated that should the Board accept the Planning Director's recommendation, and the applicant must appear before the Council but increase in roadway width is not adopted by that body, it may be that another public hearing must be held by the Planning Board until there is an agreement.

Planning Director Cassidy stated that the State Fire regulation that specifies a minimum width of 20' for ways providing emergency access would probably be sufficient for an alleyway that is used infrequently if ever; that is a different scenario from accommodating two-way traffic in a relatively dense residential setting on a daily basis.

Ms. Claudia Bolgen stated that she believes it would not be appropriate for the Board to contradict the Council's adoption of the Plan of Record in terms of road width, particularly due to the amount of time and effort that was put into the review and consideration process by the City Council.

Mr. Dave Edmonds stated that he defers to safety experts, such as the Fire Department, in consideration of aspects like roadway width.

Mr. Bob Doherty stated that he withdraws his motion;
Mr. Dave Edmonds withdrew his second.

Motion to approve the current Plan of Record to allow more than one dwelling on a building lot, subject to the Council's conditions of approval, made by Ms. Claudia Bolgen;
Seconded by Mr. Dave Edmonds;
Motion carried, 6-0-0, with Mr. Michael Ventresca recusing.

Mr. Ventresca rejoined the meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING: PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO PLANNING BOARD'S SUBDIVISION RULES AND REGULATIONS RELATIVE TO FEES AND NEW REQUIREMENT FOR SUBMISSION OF CONCEPTUAL CONSTRUCTION TIME LINE WITH DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION PLAN APPLICATIONS (PLANNING BOARD STAFF)

Planning Director Cassidy provided an overview of the proposed draft fee requirements and the submission of a conceptual construction timeline, as well as the background on how these fees were developed. The drafts have been forwarded to multiple departments and private parties of interest to solicit their comments.

Planning Director Cassidy stated that staff have received one comment relative to this matter, which is that timing as to contact and servicing by utility companies, as well as state and federal permitting, are major variables in terms of a construction timeline. Developers have little to no control over these variables.

Mr. Jim Callahan stated that the comment provided relative to consideration of utilities and permits is something that he agrees is important and to which the Board and Planning staff will need to pay close attention.

Planning Director Cassidy stated that it may be helpful to include a new entry in the draft conceptual timeline to incorporate proposed developer contact with utility companies (at the 5th line after "blasting" and prior to "utility construction").

Mr. Jim Callahan stated that it may be that the Board also imposes contact with utility companies within 30 days of project approval, as a condition of approval.

Ms. Carolyn Turner inquired whether it is in the Planning Board's authority to impose a condition relative to utility contact. Planning Director Cassidy responded that this may be something that the Board would want to consider during the public hearing of its next subdivision filing.

Ms. Carolyn Turner inquired about the new fee structure for ANR filings. Planning Director Cassidy stated that it is not dependent upon the number of lots involved necessarily; it is based on whether lot lines are being adjusted or whether new building lots are being created.

Mr. Dave Edmonds inquired about whether the draft fee structure must be adopted by the City Council. Planning Director stated that the Planning Board has full authority over its own fee schedule and explained the process of adoption/recordation.

Chair Carolyn Turner opened this matter for a public hearing and asked any members of the audience who would like to step forward to address the Board to please do so.

PUBLIC HEARING

No one stepped forward.

Motion to close the public hearing made by Mr. Dave Edmonds;
Seconded by Ms. Claudia Bolgen;
Motion carried, 7-0-0.

Motion to accept both the proposed conceptual subdivision timeline requirement and schedule of Planning Board filing fees, as drafted, made by Mr. Dave Edmonds;
Seconded by Mr. Jim Callahan;
Motion carried, 7-0-0.

Tyler Street Subdivision: Acceptance of As-Built and Street Acceptance Plans, Release of Remaining Surety and Issuance of Certificate of Completion (Mr. Robert Murray)

Ms. Carolyn Turner recused herself from discussion on this matter and Mr. Michael Ventresca assumed the role of Chair pro tem.

Planning Director Cassidy provided an overview of the status of this request and that the Engineering Department has reviewed the submitted as-built and street acceptance plans and found that both are acceptable.

Accordingly, Planning Director Cassidy recommended affirmatively to accept the as-built and street acceptance plans, to endorse and issue the Certificate of Completion and to release all remaining surety that had been posted to guarantee subdivision completion.

Motion to accept the Planning Director's recommendation made by Mr. Bob Doherty;
Seconded by Mr. Jim Callahan;
Motion carried, 6-0-0, with Chair Carolyn Turner recusing.

Chair Turner resumed the chairmanship.

Tufts Road Subdivision (89 Wyman Street): Accept drainage easements and HOA documents, request for extension of construction completion date (Mr. George Gately, Jr.)

Planning Director Cassidy provided an overview of the request and the status of the easement documents to be accepted. The current draft documents reflect changes that were made in response to feedback from City Solicitor Ellen Callahan-Doucette.

Planning Director Cassidy further stated that due to the fact the easement document has been revised but not yet executed, she would recommend that the Board, should they opt to extend the completion date for this subdivision, to do so subject to the developer filing a completed and executed easement document within seven (7) days.

Mr. George Gately, project developer, stated that he was not able to complete this subdivision during the two-year period because he was completing another subdivision nearby (30 Wyman) consisting of 32 homes. He envisions that all of the houses in the Tufts Road subdivision will be built by the end of this calendar year (2 of the 4 are completed thus far).

Mr. Jim Callahan inquired as to whether Mr. Gately intends to complete as-built and street acceptance plans, in addition to installation of stone bounds, by the end of June 2018. Mr. Gately responded yes. In addition, sidewalks and curbing should be completed by the end of this year.

Planning Director Cassidy stated that the Planning office has not received any complaints from residents or abutting neighbors regarding this subdivision.

Motion to extend the construction completion date for the Tufts Road subdivision to June 1, 2018, subject to submission of approved, executed easement documents within seven (7) days, made by Mr. Dave Edmonds;
Seconded by Mr. Jim Callahan;
Motion carried, 7-0-0.

Watson Lane Subdivision (30 Wyman Street): Extension of construction completion date (Mr. George Gately, Jr.)

Mr. George Gately stated that he is very close to completing this subdivision and only has landscaping to complete. The project was approved in 2014, and between 2015 and now he has built all 32 homes as approved. It is difficult to meet the two-year deadline for this particular type of subdivision given the number of homes involved. Due to the scale of the project, the construction of the roadway was also difficult to complete within the allotted timeframe.

Planning Director Cassidy stated that this situation is a good illustration as to why there should be detailed discussion when a subdivision completion date is established.

Motion to extend the construction completion date for the Watson Lane subdivision until June 1, 2018, made by Mr. Dave Edmonds;
Seconded by Mr. Bob Doherty;
Motion carried, 7-0-0.

Legacy Lane Subdivision: Accept emergency access and private drainage easements and Homeowners' Association (HOA) documents (Mr. Frank J. Michienzi)

Planning Director Cassidy stated that this matter is not ready for discussion because review of the documents is not complete yet; the matter will be placed on a future agenda.

Carlson Way Subdivision: Request for bond reduction (Mr. Brian Melanson)

Planning Director Cassidy provided an overview of the request, which was submitted to the Department of Engineering for review. The Engineering Department recommends the bond be reduced to \$35,000 and the Planning Director recommended the Board vote accordingly.

Motion to accept the Planning Director's recommendation to reduce the bond for the Carlson Way subdivision to \$35,000, made by Mr. Dave Edmonds;
Seconded by Mr. Bob Doherty;
Motion carried, 7-0-0.

Fremont Street Extension: Request for bond release (Seaver Construction LLC)

Planning Director Cassidy stated that the Department of Public Works Director estimated the Board should continue to hold somewhere between \$5,000-\$8,000 in order to guarantee the trench work in Washington Street is completed to the Department's satisfaction. Accordingly, Planning Director Cassidy recommended the Board reduce the bond amount held to guarantee completion of this project at \$7,500.

Motion to accept the Planning Director's recommendation made by Mr. Dave Edmonds;
Seconded by Ms. Claudia Bolgen;
Motion carried, 7-0-0.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 23, 2017 Meeting

Motion to approve the meeting minutes, as drafted, by Mr. Jim Callahan;
Seconded by Mr. Bob Doherty;
Motion carried, 6-0-1, with Ms. Claudia Bolgen abstaining due to absence at the meeting absence.

PLANNING BOARD DIRECTOR UPDATE:

Remote meeting participation by Board members

City Planner/Grant Writer Orr stated that he is still working with Dave Mastronardi to test-out/setup the City's "Go To Meeting" account to determine whether it will work as an option for Planning members' remote participation. He hopes to have a further update at the Board's August 8th meeting.

Other

Planning Director Cassidy stated that it was nice to observe the process for awarding the affordable housing units set aside at the Baldwin Woods project. The process went smoothly and she anticipates that the affordable units in Mr. Seaver's Shannon Farm project will also be well-received.

Authorization of Chair to endorse ANRs on the Board's behalf

Planning Director Cassidy recommended that the Board vote to authorize Chair Carolyn Turner to endorse ANRs on the Board's behalf until September 1, 2017 as well the authority to decline ANRs should the need present itself.

Motion to authorize Chair Carolyn Turner to either solely endorse or deny ANR applications on behalf of the Woburn Planning Board until September 1, 2017, made by Mr. Dave Edmonds;
Seconded by Mr. Jim Callahan;
Motion carried, 7-0-0.

OTHER BUSINESS MATTERS THAT MAY LEGALLY COME BEFORE THE BOARD NOT KNOWN AT THE TIME OF POSTING

855 Main Street (Seaver Construction LLC)

Planning Director Cassidy stated the Petitioner has submitted a request for the Board to release the remaining bond monies for this project. However, the reviewing departments, including Engineering and Public Works, did not have sufficient time to review the request and issue a recommendation in preparation for this meeting. Due to the statutory requirement to process this release request within

45 days, the Planning Director is recommending that the Board deny the request. The request can be refiled by the applicant and reconsidered at the Board’s next meeting.

Motion to deny the request for a bond release for the project at 855 Main Street, made by Ms. Claudia Bolgen;

Seconded by Mr. Dave Edmonds;

Motion carried, 7-0-0.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn at 9:20, made by Ms. Claudia Bolgen;

Seconded by Mr. Bob Doherty;

Motion carried, 7-0-0.

Table of Documents Used at Meeting

Staff Report
ANR Application for 124-130 Lexington Street
Petition for Zoning Amendment Relative to Definition of Mixed Use Hotel/Restaurant
Petitioner Handout: conceptual rendering of the front elevation for the mixed-use hotel structure for property at 369 Washington Street
Petitioner Handout: existing conceptual rendering of the site plan for property at 369 Washington Street
Copy of Plan and Application for “More than One Dwelling on a Building Lot” at 285, 287 and 299 Lexington Street
Copy of City Council Special Permit Decision for 285, 287 and 299 Lexington Street
Proposed amendments to Planning Board’s Subdivision Rules and Regulations relative to fees and new requirement for submission of conceptual construction time line with Definitive Subdivision plan applications
Copy of Engineering Department comments on Tyler Street Definitive Subdivision (acceptance of As-built and Street Acceptance plans, release of remaining surety and issuance of Certificate of Completion)
Tufts Road Definitive Subdivision (89 Wyman Street): Copies of the current draft drainage easement and HOA documents, the developer’s extension request letter, and a comment letter from the Engineering Department stating no exception to the developer’s request

APPROVED

Watson Lane Definitive Subdivision (30 Wyman Street): Copies of the developer's extension request letter and comment letter from the Engineering Department relative to extension of completion date

Legacy Lane Definitive Subdivision (83 & 87 Middle Street): Copies of the current draft emergency access, drainage easement and proposed HOA documents

Carlson Way Definitive Subdivision: Copy of Engineering Department memo relative to request for bond reduction

Respectfully submitted,



Dan Orr
City Planner/Grant Writer