

Approved Meeting Minutes
December 12, 2017 | Planning Board Meeting
7:00 P.M. | Engineering Conference Room, Woburn City Hall

ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Mr. Bob Doherty, Mr. Michael Ventresca, Mr. Dave Edmonds, Chair Carolyn Turner were present. Ms. Claudia Bolgen participated remotely via telephone. Mr. Jim Callahan and Mr. Kevin Donovan were absent. Also present were Planning Director Tina Cassidy and Planner Karen Smith.

Chair Turner announced that member Claudia Bolgen will be participating in this meeting remotely, having requested permission to so participate and such permission having been granted.

Bolgen indicated she was missing one page of the staff report materials. Planner Smith emailed the page to her and Bolgen confirmed receipt.

30 CENTRAL STREET ANR / Paul Costello

Turner recused herself from discussion of this matter and Ventresca assumed the role of Chair pro tem.

Planning Director Cassidy provided an overview of the ANR application stating the owners of two properties on Central Street intend to reconfigure lot lines affecting two parcels resulting in a total of three reconfigured parcels (two existing reconfigured lots and one new building lot). No zoning non-conformities are created as a result of the reconfiguration. Newly-configured Lot 3 will have the appropriate amount of street frontage on Utica Street and contain 15,791 sq. ft. of land area. As a result, Cassidy recommended the Board endorse the plan as one not requiring approval under the Subdivision Control Law.

Motion to endorse the ANR plan, as submitted, made by Edmonds;

Seconded by Doherty;

Roll call vote on the Motion: Doherty – in favor
 Bolgen - in favor
 Ventresca – in favor
 Edmonds - in favor

Motion carried 4-0.

Chair pro tem Ventresca stepped down and Turner re-assumed the role of Chair.

371-375 MAIN STREET ANR / Leo Realty Holdings LLC

Cassidy provided an overview of the ANR application stating the owner of 371 and 375 Main Street intends to combine two lots, Lot 1 (containing 3,120 sq. ft.) and Lot 2 (containing 2,987 sq. ft.) to create a single new parcel (proposed Lot 3) containing a combined land area of 6,107 sq. ft. No new building lots or any zoning non-conformities will be created as a result of the reconfiguration. Newly-configured Lot 3 will have the appropriate amount of street frontage on Main Street (a minimum of 50' per Woburn Zoning Ordinances). As a result, Cassidy recommended the Board endorse the plan as one not requiring approval under the Subdivision Control Law.

Motion to approve the ANR plan, as submitted, made by Edmonds;

Seconded by Doherty;

Roll call vote on the motion: Doherty – in favor
Bolgen - in favor
Ventresca – in favor
Edmonds - in favor
Turner – in favor

Motion carried, 5-0.

LAND AT THE INTERSECTION OF FLORENCE AND KENSINGTON AVENUES ANR / Peter C. Spinazola

Cassidy provided an overview of the ANR applications stating the owner of land at Florence and Kensington Avenues intends to combine the two lots currently shown as Assessors Map 3, Block 5, Lot 3 (containing 2,377 sq. ft.) and Map 3, Block 5, Lot 4 (containing 8,410 sq. ft.) to create one parcel of 10,787 sq. ft. The reconfigured lot will have the appropriate amount of street frontage on Kensington Avenue. As a result, Cassidy recommended the Board endorse the plan as one not requiring approval under the Subdivision Control Law.

Motion to approve the ANR plan, as submitted, made by Edmonds;
Seconded by Doherty;

Roll call vote on the motion: Doherty – in favor
Bolgen - in favor
Ventresca – in favor
Edmonds - in favor
Turner – in favor

Motion carried, 5-0.

PUBLIC HEARING: Federal Street SGOD / Jamieson Properties

Cassidy presented an overview of the project, the Public Hearing for which opened on September 26, 2017 and noted potential major points of concern with the proposed ordinance included (a) proposed density of the project; (b) parking provided on-site and extent of use of a nearby municipal parking lot to serve remaining demand; (c) physical appearance of the proposed building and (c) use of the apartments by Airbnb or similar on-line vacation rental service. Cassidy noted that Attorney Tarby has offered assurance that his client would be willing to include provisions in all lease/rental agreements prohibiting tenant Airbnb rentals.

Attorney Joseph Tarby of the law firm Murtha Cullina, LLP requested permission to submit to the Board a document titled “Revisions Proposed by Murtha Cullina LLP and Tina Cassidy, Planning Director November 14, 2017 Revised Further by MCLLC, December 12, 2017, Section 31”.

Motion to accept the document presented by Attorney Tarby, as submitted, made by Edmonds;
Seconded by Doherty;

Roll call vote on the motion: Doherty – in favor
Bolgen - in favor
Ventresca – in favor
Edmonds - in favor
Turner – in favor

Motion carried, 5-0.

Planner Smith scanned and emailed copies of Attorney Tarby’s document and three Powerpoint slides to Bolgen who confirmed receipt.

Attorney Tarby detailed his 40R district proposal of 48 units of which 25% of the units would be affordable allowing the City to count all 48 units toward its 10% affordable housing requirement while noting Woburn Housing Production Plan calls for additional housing in the downtown area. Tarby's submission included three new slides to his original PowerPoint. His first revision was deleting any references to "phasing" rights which he stated were not applicable; his second revision involved "off-site units" as he added proposed language which would allow the property owner to place some of the affordable units in additional properties he owns in Ward 2, such as the 44 Montvale Avenue apartment complex noting the language he added is identical to Section 11 of the Woburn Zoning ordinance as he replaced "special permit" with "plan approval" and replaced 10% with 25%; and the third revision modified the size of permitted signs from 40 square feet to 16 square feet.

Tarby stated he would like the Board's permission to continue the Public Hearing to the January 9, 2018 meeting to incorporate Cassidy's comments and proposed recommendations that he recently received into their proposal.

Tarby provided an overview of other realistic/significant uses the to which the property could be put under Section 5.1 Table of Use Regulations such as dwelling units above a commercial structure; child care center; physical fitness training facility; hotel; retail use; bank; office; medical/dental office; and veterinarian office.

Mr. Glenn Morris of Morris Architects, 33 Murray Road, West Newton, MA asked for permission to submit three additional Powerpoint slides.

Motion to accept the material from Mr. Morris, as submitted, made by Edmonds;
Seconded by Doherty;

Roll call vote on the motion: Doherty – in favor
 Bolgen - in favor
 Ventresca – in favor
 Edmonds - in favor
 Turner – in favor

Motion carried, 5-0.

Morris provided an overview of the three additional PowerPoint slides. At the November 28, 2017 Planning Board meeting, the Board requested a comparison to the Town of Reading's 40R project at 30 Haven Street located near the train station. Morris stated Reading has 53 one and two-bedroom units in a four-story building. Actual studies show their tenants use no more than one car per unit and no unit utilizes more than one space. Project was designed to allow 1.25 cars per unit. The landlord provides only one unit with unit rent while offering additional space(s) for additional rent but there are no takers according to a peer-review report prepared for the Reading Planning Department. Twenty percent of the units are affordable. The first floor contains 22,000 square feet of retail space and 78 parking spaces. Tenants include a wine and cheese store, pizzeria, ATM, karate studio and a frozen yogurt store.

Morris continued providing information on 44 Montvale Avenue, Woburn which has 45 total units, studios and one-bedroom apartments in a seven-story building. There are 0.76 cars per unit and no unit utilizes more than one space while there are 1.38 occupants per unit. Morris stated 75% of the units are rented by companies for their workers that are temporarily relocating to the area. Companies include Shriners Hospital for Children, Harvard University, The Department of Homeland Security, Leaf Pharmaceuticals, Philips Color Kinetics, and IBEW.

Morris stated if the Jamieson's were not proposing this 40R project in a Smart Grown Overlay District they may have proposed a Commercial/Residential project under the current zoning laws and applied for a Special Permit through the City Council. That potential project possibly may have contained 25 Residential units (16 one bedrooms and 10 studio apartments), 11,000 SF of commercial space, and 46 parking spaces in a two-story garage with 37 spaces off-site. Ten percent of the units (3 units) would be affordable and it would be built in a three-story building within the 40' height limit.

Morris stated the current proposed Federal Street project is a 4-story building with a 40' height limit that will have 48 residential units consisting of 17 studios and 31 one bedrooms with 28 parking spaces in garage and 32 spaces off-site in the municipal lot. Twenty-five percent of the units will be affordable allowing all 48 units to contribute to the city's 10% state subsidized housing inventory.

Cassidy inquired about the possibility of constructing a 2-story garage with the project.

Morris replied he created a design for a two-story garage if the applicants chose to apply for a commercial/residential project with a special permit. Morris further stated while the original design had some inefficiencies (due to the ramp) it did allow for approximately 20 additional spaces on a second garage level.

Edmonds inquired if 25% of the units are affordable and you have the option to move those units off-site, will all 48 units in the new building count as affordable in addition to the 12 offsite, and if so, we would be gaining a total of 60 affordable units?

Cassidy responded that she did not believe that would be the case but said she would investigate the answer.

Chair Turner inquired about the length of terms of the leases at 44 Montvale Avenue and what the applicants foresee in terms of leases and corporate rentals for this proposed project.

Property owner Bob Jamieson responded that the required minimum length of stay is one month and the average length of stay is 5 to 6 months. He added that some tenants at Montvale Avenue have been residents for over ten years. Jamieson plans on renting the Federal Street property to similar clients as the Montvale Avenue complex and will also face new dealings with renting the affordable units.

Mike Ventresca inquired about the downtown parking scenario, specifically the potential of a two-story garage.

Morris responded the applicants, as a group, have not had an opportunity yet to talk internally about the two-story garage within the 40R scenario. He further explained that the complication under the 40R proposal, specifically increasing the percentage of affordable units from 20% to 25%, is as those number of affordable units go up, it tends to tighten up the economics.

Ventresca inquired about improving the flow of traffic and improving the utilization of spaces in the municipal lot at Library Park.

Cassidy will check with the Engineering Department to see if they have any results of recent studies involving that particular lot and if there is potential to reconfigure the existing lot to create additional spaces.

Bolgen discussed the potential creative options to address the concern of relying on the nearby municipal lot summarizing two creative solutions: adding one extra layer to the parking garage and the reconfiguration of the municipal lot to create new spaces.

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.

There being no members of the audience wanting to address the Board, Turner asked for a motion.

Cassidy recommended the Planning Board accept Attorney Tarby's request to continue the Public Hearing to the Planning Board's meeting on January 9, 2018 at 7 p.m.

Motion to continue the public hearing to January 9, 2018 made by Edmonds;
Seconded by Doherty;

Roll call vote on the motion: Doherty - in favor
Bolgen - in favor
Ventresca - in favor
Edmonds - in favor
Turner - in favor

Motion carried, 5-0.

PUBLIC HEARING: Petition to amend Section 11.3.11 of the Zoning Ordinance entitled Procedures for Special Permits by deleting "six (6) months" and replacing same with "twelve (12) months"

Cassidy summarized this zoning amendment measure was introduced by Alderman Michael Anderson in response to a memo circulated by City Solicitor Ellen Callahan Doucette. The issue is the conditions under which a Special Permit remains valid per the current language of the Woburn Zoning Ordinances (WZO). The City's zoning currently stipulates the "construction or operations under a Special Permit shall conform to any subsequent amendment to this ordinance unless the use or construction is commenced within a period of not more than six (6) months after the issuance of the permit and in cases involving construction, unless such construction is continued through to completion as continuously and expeditiously as is reasonable." However, per Solicitor Callahan-Doucette's letter, Woburn's current ordinance is now inconsistent with State law which was recently revised to extend the period to twelve (12) months.

Cassidy recommended that the Planning Board recommend to the City Council it adopt the proposed zoning change.

Motion made to accept Cassidy's recommendation made by Doherty;

Seconded by Edmonds;

Motion withdrawn by Doherty;

Second withdrawn by Edmonds;

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. There being no members of the audience wanting to address the Board, Turner asked for a motion.

Motion to close the public hearing made by Doherty;

Seconded by Edmonds;

Roll call vote on the motion: Doherty - in favor
Bolgen - in favor

Ventresca – in favor
Edmonds - in favor
Turner – in favor

Motion to close the public hearing carried 5-0.

Motion made to accept Cassidy's recommendation made by Doherty;
Seconded by Edmonds;

Roll call vote on the motion: Doherty – in favor
Bolgen - in favor
Ventresca – in favor
Edmonds - in favor
Turner – in favor

Motion carried 5-0.

SUBDIVISIONS:

EAST DEXTER / WARREN / NORTH MAPLE / NAPLES AVENUE PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAN / Arthur Brussard Trust

Cassidy provided a brief review of the preliminary subdivision that was filed by Mr. Brussard for properties in two locations in North Woburn: A series of parcels between Dexter Avenue and North Maple Street and a parcel of land off Naples Avenue.

Cassidy stated that at the last meeting, members urged Mr. Brussard to have his attorney contact the Planning Director to discuss the issues staff had identified as questions and shortcomings with the application. The owner's engineer, Allen & Major, also vowed to revise the preliminary plan to address a potential zoning violation relative to accessing industrial land from a residential zoning district. The plan has been revised and Building Commissioner Tom Quinn, Jr. has commented that the revised plan addresses the concern about a violation of the zoning provision relative to access across residential districts. He also indicated that he cannot speak to development on each lot until he sees specific building permit plans.

Cassidy noted she received correspondence from Mr. Brussard's representative, Attorney Edward J. Lonergan of 101 Merrimac Street, Suite 810, Boston, MA 02114-9601, which (a) purported to withdraw the Naples Avenue portion of the plan; (b) included a letter from the legal representative (Attorney Bruce Miller of Pierce Atwood LLP, 100 Summer Street, 22nd Floor, Boston, MA 02110) of the individual (John D. DiNatale, III, trustee of Dexter Avenue Realty Trust) who claims to own several of the "North Maple Street portion" of the development, which letter assents to the filing of the preliminary subdivision application; and (c) claimed the preliminary plan does not propose any activities that would affect the rights of third parties to various paper streets, and that no one other than Mr. Brussard has rights to the paper street known as Hinckley Street.

Cassidy reiterated the city is aware of an on-going legal matter related to the question of exactly who owns some of this former tax title property and reached out to City Solicitor Ellen Callahan Doucette for direction and advice. The City Solicitor responded that "Attorney Miller is referring to it as a 'perimeter plan' and that Mr. Natale does assent." She inferred from that response that the question of ownership of the land involved in the subdivision is an appropriate one for the Board to raise.

Mr. Nick Dellacava, Civil Engineer representing Allen & Major Associates, stated the applicant wishes to withdraw the Naples Avenue portion of the submitted preliminary plan and will move forward with only the North Maple Street subdivision.

Cassidy stated that absent a revised plan deleting the Naples Avenue portion of the proposal, any decision the Board makes must include the Naples Avenue portion of the plan in its decision; and the developer will be free to delete the Naples Avenue portion if and when they prepare a definitive subdivision plan in the future.

Dellacava provided a brief overview of the plan noting the first draft of the plan did not conform to zoning. They have revised the plan to now provide access off North Maple Street. The site is comprised of 3.9 acres of undisturbed area covered in trees; surrounding abutters consist of retail and commercial uses as well as single and multi-family residences. Dellacava continued to describe the short cul-de-sac stating that it demonstrates compliance with all zoning lot, area, frontage and width according to the city's subdivision rules and regulations while noting its length is approximately 520 feet long; the minimum right away width is 40 feet with a minimum drivable pavement width of 20 feet; and the minimum turnaround right of way diameter is 120 feet and its minimum pavement width is 100 feet. He further spoke regarding utilities on the site, water, sewer, gas, electric, phone, hydrants, drainage, and grading.

Cassidy explained the differences between a Type 1, Type 2 and Type 3 roadway. She noted it is very clear that this project is a Type 3 as it will serve residential *and* commercial/industrial properties. Therefore, the right of way requirement increases from 40' to 60' and the minimum pavement width increases from 20' to 44' which is greater than what is currently shown on the plan. Cassidy added this information is also noted in the most recent review from the Engineering Department. She further explained that a short cul-de-sac is defined as a street having a maximum length of 200' and serves a maximum of four single family house lots/dwellings and does not have the possibility of extending or serving other properties. This proposed subdivision services less than four single family units but it also serves 3 commercial lots.

Bolgen clarified that although the street as drawn meets the design dimensionally for a short cul-de-sac, it does not meet the use requirement under our ordinances.

Dellacava noted it is his understanding the cul-de-sac on the revised plan meets the requirements for short cul-de-sac. He added he is able to refine the plan through the definitive process to meet the requirements of the subdivision rules and regulations.

Ventresca stated applicants often use the provided feedback during the preliminary process to improve their definitive plan applications.

Cassidy summarized that she would incorporate all issues discussed here including all references to Naples Avenue be withdrawn, into the Board's decision letter and recommended the Board deny the application for the following reasons: The plan purports to extinguish portions of the layouts of Warren Avenue which are paper streets that run through this subdivision and the Petitioner has not provided evidence that he has the legal right to do so; There is no indication that the Petitioner has the legal right/authority to extend/alter the layout of Hinckley Street as shown on the plan; The plan does not include required information relative to the sizes of existing and proposed utility lines and depicts an unacceptable water connection to the main in East Dexter Street as well as unacceptable drain line material; The plan does not include a required typical cross-section; and the proposed roadway is designed as a 40' right-of-way with a pavement width of 20' as the Board's Rules and Regulations state a subdivision providing access to commercial and industrial lots require a minimum right-of-way width of 60' and a pavement width of 44'.

Cassidy further stated should the Petitioner advance to the definitive plan stage in the future it must include detailed topography and sidewalk, retaining wall, and handicapped access information that

is appropriate and the plan shall not propose to use the name Warren Avenue as there are streets in the City with nearly identical/identical names per the Police Chief.

Edmonds made a motion to accept the Director's recommendation. It was not seconded. Edmonds withdrew his motion.

Attorney Ed Lonergan, representing the Petitioner, respectfully requested the Board reconsider the approving the Director's recommendation. He noted the engineer will work out the technical matters in the definitive stage. He added the paper streets on this property were set out in 1888 and have not been used by anyone and are not necessary for any other lot in the original subdivision for access, egress, or drainage. He continued they have every legal right to proceed as proposed as they are the owners on both sides of Hinkley Street and stated there are not other lot owners with any need for that property. He stated Warren Avenue may be a little different as it is owned by Mr. Devine and Mr. Seaver and theoretically they could raise an issue although there isn't reason to as Mr. Seaver is the prospective purchaser of his client's property. Attorney Lonergan stated that his client is eighty years old and would like to move the process along as quickly as possible and urged the Board to reconsider the denial.

Bolgen questioned the ability to orally request a waiver for the right of way from 40' to 60' and asked for Cassidy's opinion.

Cassidy noted she is not familiar with an oral waiver request but added that the Board would not have any departmental comments on the waiver request.

Doherty noted there should have been a waiver request and added there should have been two separate preliminary subdivision applications submitted.

Cassidy stated she submitted a list of potential reasons for denial to City Solicitor Ellen Callahan Doucette when she asked for her opinion relative to the question of lot ownership. The City Solicitor responded that "Attorney Miller is referring to it as a 'perimeter plan' and the Mr. Natale does assent."

Turner stated that Attorney Miller's letter noted the third-party assents to the filing of the plan and that she has difficulty relying on that assent. She added with respect to ownership issues, she has not seen a deed. Turner noted that while the applicant is withdrawing the Naples Ave portion of the plan, it could be problematic that both plans are included in the single application.

Cassidy noted the plan has many references to the Naples Ave subdivision while listing issues/potential problems such as the right-of-way, drainage, proper ownership of certain parcels, and former railroad rights-of-way to name a few.

Motion made to accept the Director's recommendation to deny the preliminary plan for the reasons articulated made by Edmonds;

Seconded by Doherty;

Roll call vote on the motion: Doherty - in favor
Bolgen - in favor
Ventresca - in favor
Edmonds - in favor
Turner - in favor

Motion carried 5-0.

HIGHVIEW ESTATES SUBDIVISION / Santullo Construction (SANCO)

Edmonds recused himself from discussion of this agenda item.

Cassidy summarized this subdivision was approved approximately ten years ago and a two-year completion date extension was granted in September 2015. The applicant has filed a request for an additional two years' time based on the fact that the developer has filed litigation against Eversource relative to its requirements for working within one of its easements. The lawsuit allegedly has precluded Santullo from developing his property.

Attorney Daniel Moynihan of the Law of Offices of Daniel Moynihan, 271 Main Street, Stoneham, MA, represented Santullo/SANCO, stated the reason for the request is that a lawsuit was filed by the developer against Eversource relative to the necessary permits needed to proceed with the subdivision. The developer was issued a cease and desist by Eversource on the 80-year-old common law easement. The litigation is currently in Middlesex Superior Court. Eversource advised the developer to submit additional plans as to where the access way would be and also requested a particularized blast plan. Attorney Moynihan requested permission to submit a copy of the plan showing the pole access plan over the Highview Estates subdivision.

Motion to accept the handout made by Doherty;
Seconded by Bolgen;

Roll call vote on the motion: Doherty – in favor
 Bolgen - in favor
 Ventresca – in favor
 Turner – in favor

Motion carried 4-0.

Staff scanned and emailed the document to Bolgen and she confirmed receipt.

Attorney Moynihan noted the plan shows the access roads his client agreed to build so Eversource may access their poles. He also noted the prior extension request was for financing reasons and financing is no longer an issue.

Bolgen asked if the plan is the same subdivision plan that was approved in 2007.

Moynihan stated it is the same subdivision plan as was approved in 2007 and this new plan was drafted at the request of Eversource to show a visual of the access way. Moynihan stated what has been added at a minimum is the gravel driveways and some notes on transitional site grading to access the drive.

Cassidy stated due to the fact there is pending litigation and the Attorney is moving for summary judgement she is inclined to grant an extension of the completion date. She added she would like to grant a six-month extension rather than a two-year extension and have the applicant come back with an updated status report.

Turner asked Attorney Moynihan if he could file another request for status from the court and possibly bump their case to a fast track.

Attorney Moynihan stated due to the nature of the claim it is currently assigned to an average track. His proposal to the court would be to file to expediate it to a fast track.

Cassidy asked the developer through his attorney if the trailer that was located on the property and had been vandalized would be returning to the property. Mr. Santullo said he gave it away and Cassidy asked if that meant it would not be returning. Mr. Santullo said it would not be returning. She asked if he was intending to put a different trailer there. Mr. Santullo said no.

Cassidy recommended the Board vote to grant a six-month extension of the construction completion date for the Highview Estates subdivision which would extend the completion date to July 31, 2018.

Motion to accept the director's recommendation made by Doherty;
Seconded by Ventresca;

Bolgen commented due to slow moving litigation in the Middlesex Superior Court perhaps the applicant could apply for his next extension through a letter due to the nature of the request as opposed to having an attorney appear to represent him.

Cassidy recommended the developer and/or his attorney update the Board in writing on the status of the pending litigation and request a further extension of the completion date by June 30, 2018. The Board will notify the applicant before July 31, 2018 if he or his representatives will need to appear before the Board at the July meeting.

Bolgen suggested the motion be revised to also include a requirement that the developer submit a written update on the pending legal matter by June 30, 2018

Motion to amend the proposed motion made by Doherty;
Seconded by Ventresca;

Roll call vote on the motion: Doherty - in favor
Bolgen - in favor
Ventresca - in favor
Turner - in favor

Motion carried 4-0.

Motion to extend the construction completion date of the Highview Estates subdivision for a period of six months to July 31, 2018 on the condition that the developer or his attorney will update the board in writing at least 30 days in advance of the expiration of the construction completion date and at the time will also request an additional extension of time, made by Doherty;

Motion seconded by Ventresca;

Roll call vote on the motion: Doherty - in favor
Bolgen - in favor
Ventresca - in favor
Turner - in favor

Motion carried 4-0.

Edmonds returned to his seat to participate in the meeting.

RUSSO ESTATES / William Scire and Carmen Russo, Jr.

Cassidy stated this subdivision is nearing its completion date. The developers appeared before the Board to provide an update on subdivision status at the August 8, 2017 meeting.

After a brief discussion regarding concern of lack of progress on the project, Cassidy recommended that the Board extend the construction completion date of the Russo Estates subdivision to January

25, 2018 and instruct staff send a letter to applicant and his attorney asking for a response by January 4, 2018 in time for discussion at the January 9, 2018 meeting.

Motion to accept the Director's recommendation made by Ventresca,
Seconded by Edmonds;

Roll call vote on the motion: Doherty - in favor
Bolgen - in favor
Ventresca - in favor
Edmonds - in favor
Turner - in favor

Motion carried 5-0-0.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Turner stated that the next matter concerned approval of draft minutes of the last meeting. Regarding the Meeting Minutes of November 14, 2017 Turner asked that the minutes specifically state that she recused herself for both the Wall Estates and Dragon Court discussions. Bolgen requested an edit on page 4 to substitute the word "diverse" for the word "flexible".

Motion to accept the November 14, 2017 Planning Board Meeting Minutes with the amendments noted above made by Doherty;

Seconded by Bolgen;

Roll call vote on the motion: Doherty - in favor
Bolgen - in favor
Turner - in favor
Ventresca - abstain
Edmonds - abstain.

Motion carried 3-0-2 (Ventresca and Edmonds abstained).

PLANNING DIRECTOR UPDATE

Cassidy noted the next meeting will be held on January 9, 2018 and will include a discussion on the Russo Estates Subdivision and the continued Public Hearing on the Federal Street Smart Growth Overlay District proposal.

Motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:20 p.m. made by Bolgen;

Seconded by Doherty;

Roll call vote on the motion: Doherty - in favor
Bolgen - in favor
Turner - in favor
Ventresca - in favor
Edmonds - in favor

Motion carried 5-0.

Table of Documents Used At Meeting

Staff Report
30 Central Street ANR Application
371-375 Main Street ANR Application
Kensington and Florence Avenues ANR Application

Federal Street / Smart Growth Overlay District Public Hearing: Three new PowerPoint Slides showing Comparison of Scenarios for Federal Street Development and Comparable Projects at 30 Haven Street in Reading and 44 Montvale Avenue in Woburn
Copy of Revisions Proposed by Murtha Cullina LLP and Tina Cassidy, Planning Director November 14, 2017 Revised Further by MCLLPP December 12, 2017 Section 31
Public Hearing Section 11.3.11: Copy of Petition to amend Section 11.3.11 of the Zoning Ordinance entitled Procedures for Special Permits
East Dexter/Warren Ave/North Maple/Naples Avenue Preliminary Subdivision Application: Request for Comments Letter and Departmental responses
East Dexter/Warren Ave/North Maple/Naples Avenue Preliminary Subdivision Application: Copy of Revised Plan dated 11/30/2017
East Dexter/Warren Ave/North Maple/Naples Avenue Preliminary Subdivision Application: Copy of email chain from Attorney Edward Lonergan to Tina Cassidy containing Attorney Bruce Miller's letter
Highview Estates Subdivision: Copy of Decision Letter Request for Extension of Time dated 9/2/2015; Copy of Cease and Desist letter from Eversource Counsel to SANCO Builders LLC. Along with attachments regarding plans for subdivision road in NSTAR/Eversource Transmission Line Easement
Highview Estates Subdivision: Copy of Request for Extension of Time for Completion of Subdivision dated November 16, 2017
Russo Estates Subdivision: Copy of Excerpt from August 8, 2017 Planning Board Meeting Minutes; Copy of email from Dan Orr to Attorney Salvati
Copy of Recommendation from Planning Board relative to Proposed Zoning Amendments to Subsections 1,3,4 and 5 of Section 11.11 of the Woburn Zoning Ordinance (Affordable Housing Requirement)
Draft Planning Board Meeting Minutes from November 14, 2017
Letter from City Solicitor Ellen Callahan Doucette to various Boards and Commissions regarding Attorney General's Revised Open Meeting Law Regulations; and Revised City of Woburn Remote Participation Policy

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Smith
Planner