

APPROVED MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, June 23, 2020 Woburn Planning Board Meeting | 7:00 p.m.
Meeting held virtually via Zoom Platform

Chair Kevin Donovan called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm and asked Planner Karen Smith to call the roll.

Mr. Bob Doherty, Ms. Claudia Bolgen, Mr. Michael Ventresca, Ms. Carolyn Turner, Mr. Dave Edmonds, and Chair Kevin Donovan were in attendance. Mr. Jim Callahan was absent during roll call. Planning Director Tina Cassidy and Planner Karen Smith were also in attendance.

Cassidy stated the meeting was being recorded by both video and audio.

PUBLIC HEARING: 316 NEW BOSTON STREET DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION

Cassidy stated there is no impending action for deadline on this definitive application and if there are no audience members who wish to speak on the matter this evening, she would recommend the public hearing be opened and immediately continued to the July 21, 2020 Planning Board meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Donovan asked if members of the Board had any questions. Seeing none, he opened the Public Hearing and Cassidy provided detailed instructions to audience members how to participate electronically and/or by telephone.

PUBLIC HEARING

Cassidy stated she did not see anyone in the audience with their hands raised indicating they wanted to be heard.

There was no discussion.

Motion was made by Doherty to continue the Public hearing to July 21, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.;
Seconded by Bolgen;

Roll call vote on the motion to continue the Public Hearing:

Bolgen-Aye
Callahan-Absent
Doherty-Aye
Edmonds-Aye
Turner-Aye
Ventresca-Aye
Donovan-Aye

Motion carried, 6-0-0 (Callahan absent).

Callahan joined the meeting at 7:04 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING: 0 NEW BOSTON STREET DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION

Cassidy stated, for the same reason as the previous agenda item, she would like to recommend the public hearing be opened and after the audience is canvassed for comments, the public hearing for the 0 New Boston Street Definitive Subdivision should be continued to the July 21, 2020 Planning Board meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Donovan asked if members of the Board had any questions. Seeing none, he opened the Public Hearing and inquired if any members of the public wanted to be heard.

PUBLIC HEARING

Cassidy scrolled through the meeting participants and audience list and stated she did not see anyone in the audience with their hands raised indicating they wanted to be heard.

There was no discussion.

Motion was made by Doherty to continue the Public Hearing on 0 New Boston Street to July 21, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.;
Seconded by Bolgen;

Roll call vote on the motion to continue the Public Hearing:

Bolgen-Aye
Callahan-Aye
Doherty-Aye
Edmonds-Aye
Turner-Aye
Ventresca-Aye
Donovan-Aye

Motion carried, 7-0-0.

DISCUSSION / RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL ON TECHNOLOGY AND BUSINESS MIXED USE OVERLAY DISTRICT SPECIAL PERMIT APPLICATIONS (TBOD): HIGHLAND AT VALE (PULTE HOMES)

Cassidy opened the discussion stating there are two Special Permit with Site Plan Review applications that have been submitted to the City Council for projects to be developed on portions of the 60± acre master-planned redevelopment at the former Kraft/Atlantic Gelatin Facility on Hill Street located in the Technology and Business Mixed-Use Overlay District (TBOD). With special permits in the TBOD district, the Planning Board has 45 days to review the proposal and submit a recommendation to the City Council.

The first discussion focused on *Highland at Vale*.

Attorney Joseph Tarby of Murtha Cullina, 600 Unicorn Park Drive, Woburn, MA noted Montvale Land LLC, is a subsidiary of the property owner Leggat McCall. The TBOD required the negotiation of a development agreement that took place with Mayor Galvin, Planner Cassidy, Building Commissioner Tom Quinn, and other various department heads and based on that input a document was reviewed by the City Solicitor and followed up by the City Council which authorized the Mayor to sign it. The Development Agreement spells out the phases of the project and the mitigation that will be required in different phases along the way.

Tarby stated Pulte Homes of New England has submitted a Special Permit with Site Plan Review application for *Highland at Vale*, a 15.6± acre townhome and multi-family residential project that will include construction of 197 one, two, and three-bedroom home ownership residential condominium units. Of the 197 units, 75 will be townhome dwellings contained in two-and three-unit buildings and 122 units will be multi-family "garden style" units contained in three separate buildings. Thirty (30) of the 197 dwelling units (15%) will be affordable to persons and households of low and moderate income. The 197 units are included in the total maximum 300 units allowed by Special Permit under the TBOD.

Attorney Tarby discussed the waivers Pulte Homes is seeking in their Special Permit application.

Civil Engineer Matthew Leidner, of Civil Design Group, shared *Page 4* labeled *Overall Layout Plan* of the Plan set titled "Site Plan for Highland at Vale".

Bolgen asked for an explanation as to the difference between a garden style apartment and a townhome.

Mark Mastroianni, representing Pulte Homes of New England stated the 75 townhomes will be two-story with individual entrances and the homes will be in groups of two or three together with a two car garage and an individual separate entry into each unit. A garden style building is a multi-story building where there are two entries into the building and there is a common interior hallway inside the building and the project will have three buildings of this style that will have four stories over a parking level.

Callahan inquired about the phasing of the project, specifically the townhouse development, buildout of the roadway, installation of all utilities, and duration of schedule. he also inquired if there will be ledge removal involved and asked for a description of the façade materials.

Tarby asked Matt Leidner of Civil Design Group, LLC if he would share an elevation plan and describe his vision for the townhouses.

Leidner described details of the tri-plex townhomes while sharing Sheet A1 of the *Architectural Plans for Highland at Vale* prepared by Civil Design Group, LLC and prepared for Pulte Homes dated January 13, 2020. He noted the façade is comprised of different types of material and provided specific detail. Leidner displayed Sheet A2 of the same plan set to show an example of tri-plex building with three units. While displaying Sheets A3 and A5 he described additional aesthetic and character aspects of the building detail and elevation.

Mastroianni provided a summary of the overview of the sequencing of what they envision for their project site and noted Leggat McCall is responsible for constructing the ring (access) road that connects to Hill Street and out to Montvale Avenue. He provided a summary of the ring road as to how it provides access to Highland at The Vale and to the senior housing community as well (The Delaney at Vale). Leggat McCall will be doing the site work and site prep on Highland's property at the same time they are working on the ring road. Highland's intentions are to build Driveway C and the townhomes along Driveway C simultaneously with construction of Building One (Mastroianni shared *Page 4* labeled *Overall Layout Plan* of the Plan set titled "Site Plan for Highland at Vale"). Each of the four story buildings will take one year to build and will be built in a continuous fashion moving from Driveway C to Driveway B and downhill to Driveway A.

Chad Reynolds of Leggat McCall Properties spoke to the phasing aspects of the TBOD site stating the two southernmost portions of the project, Pulte and LCS, are the catalysts to the commercial phase of the development as it relates to the new roadway, utilities, demolition of the existing structures, environmental remediation, and restoration and replication of Sweetwater Brook. This work will be done before, and in some cases, concurrent with, some of the Pulte work. Reynolds stated they have filed a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the Woburn Conservation Commission for the work on Hill Street. One of the first phases of the project is to widen and improve Hill Street from Montvale into the roundabout on their site which would include a widening and reconstruction and relocation of the Mass DOT parking lot. Street lights, sidewalk and improved connection to the bike path are included in this phase. Residents of Pulte and LCS will turn right from the new roundabout and proceed on the new loop road, over a new bridge over Sweetwater Brook, and continue around the perimeter of the property to the developments (shared *Page 4* labeled *Overall Layout Plan of the Plan* set titled "Site Plan for Highland at Vale"). Reynolds described the utility route on the site.

Reynolds stated on the southernmost portion of the site there will be a fair bit of clearing in addition to ledge work on both the Pulte and LCS sites that Leggat McCall will handle. Reynolds acknowledged there will be blasting as they prepare the site to be in "pad ready" condition as per their agreement with Pulte and LCS. They are currently working on NOI's that are needed for Hill Street and the overall site; finalizing demolition and abatement permits for late summer with plans to begin site work late Fall 2020 and continuing through the winter. Reynolds noted the MWRA is currently working on the new Section 89 waterline upgrade and will also be on site running through the middle of the site replacing the existing waterline which serves Woburn, Stoneham and points north.

Ventresca inquired about detail on roadway width and pedestrian access throughout the site and stated he may have concerns about the density of the project given the proposed roadway width of only 20' and lack of sidewalks.

Tarby noted the Condominium Association will regulate parking throughout the site.

Mastroianni stated the multi-family building area has a continuous network of sidewalks and noted the pedestrian paths connect out to the access road which has a sidewalk that connects to Hill Street and Montvale Ave. In relation to the driveway areas of the townhomes that will be owned and maintained by the Homeowner's Association, they are "driveways" and not streets as they are designed to be low volume, low traffic driveways. Based on the number of units, they feel it's reasonable not to provide sidewalks and the 20' driveway width is appropriate for the type of volume these driveways will see. He continued to state it is a very tight site and they are trying to minimize impervious areas and maximize green space. He compared, and was trying to be consistent, in design with the Shannon Farm development that also has a ring road with sidewalks and pockets of driveways off the access road. The driveways are more of a common driveway with 20' road width, no sidewalk, and no curbing.

Ventresca followed up stating this project is very dense and feels there are other ways to decrease the impervious areas. He also inquired about the access road that leads into Winchester.

Tarby stated there is no access out to Sunset Road at all. The emergency access is going to be out to Forest Street in Winchester where an unpaved access currently exists.

Reynolds stated it will be a gated emergency vehicle access only.

Bolgen commented she is a bicycle advocate. She is familiar with the bike path that runs immediately in front of the project and under the Route 93 tunnel into Stoneham and she does not see any leveraging of that. She is primarily interested in bicycle access and this plan does not acknowledge alternative transportation for business or residential uses. Bolgen asked for an explanation as to what priorities the developers are using in terms of alternative public transportation.

Reynolds stated he sees the bike path as a huge amenity to the site and noted the displayed plan doesn't focus in clearly enough to see how they are looking to embrace the bike path that runs east west across the front of the site. They will be upgrading the crossing of the bike path where Hill Street makes its way to the roundabout and will be working on a new routing of the bike path with Hawk lights and will ensure that as density increases the bicyclists will have clear and safe crossings. Reynolds described the site describing where the loop road starts to curve around the future parking garage there is an embracement of the bike path that will be a bicycle-width type lane that enters the site directly off of the bike path. He noted the path has its own portion of a bridge allowing the bicyclist unfettered access across the river and will not be competing with traffic at that point. The bike path will eventually tie back into the side walk. The bike path is an amenity and the developers envision an environment where people ride to local commuter rail stations to the office in the future. Reynolds noted, closer toward Hill Street and away from the bike path, the sidewalk will be of a width greater than a standard sidewalk and will be a multi-use path to embrace bicyclists and pedestrians near the entrance to the site.

Bolgen noted the importance of design to protect vulnerable road users from cars and from each other while stating if there are both pedestrians and cyclists on demarcated areas, conflicts may still exist between those users as well. Bolgen would like to see more focus on making this site a standard bearer for alternative transportation means and take that one step further by utilizing signage, separate stripe lanes, and separate demarcation to encourage people that come here to live work and play to utilize that wonderful resource of a new bike path.

Reynolds stated the bike path is a huge amenity for future residents and bike storage and bike racks will be added to the plan. The vision is that residents of the four-story multi-family buildings will store their bikes in racks that will be provided in the parking garage and residents of the townhomes will be expected to store their bikes within the garages of their own homes. Reynolds stated that adding some exterior bike rack locations around the multifamily buildings is a great suggestion and something they will look to incorporating in the plan.

Bolgen emphasized that safety of the bicyclist on ring road is important and noted when it stops being separate and everyone is on an elevated sidewalk this strikes her as problematic. She is interested in seeing state of the art designs (noting they are not a big cost factor for developers) with the possibility that this project be a model for future projects.

Edmonds inquired about the tunnel under Route 93 and asked what's on the other side when it gets into Stoneham and if there is a safety plan to prevent it from becoming a hazard.

Reynolds stated there is a bike path that travels under Route 93 and another tunnel that connects to a private piece of land that Leggat McCall does not have any control over. Reynolds does not feel they are responsible for this piece of land but will look into its ownership. He obviously wants it to be safe and cleanly, but is unsure what leverage they have to force it to be cleaned up.

Turner asked for clarification on the 84 assisted living units and the discrepancy as to whether they are classified as dwelling units or whether they come under the definition of assisted living units, within the definition of extended care.

Tarby stated the assisted living units are licensed by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and are inspected on an annual basis by the Executive Office of Elder Affairs. After reviewing 651 CMR 12.00 (Certification Procedures and Standards for Assisted Living Residences – Department of Elder Affairs) it becomes clear to him that assisted living residents are not considered residential units when you look at the Scope and Purpose, the General Requirements for an Assisted Living Residence and other requirements. Tarby stated it is also considered under the building code to be an institutional use, not a residential use.

Turner followed up, asking if these units are proposed to have their own kitchens, bathrooms and bedrooms perhaps they would fall under the definition of living continuing care. Tarby said they would not and referred to CMR 12.04 General Requirements for an Assisted Living Residence while following up with stating the definition of a Dwelling unit in the city's building code speaks of "family". Tarby stated this is not a family, it is not a residential classification of the building code and noted it is an institutional use that is regulated by the Commonwealth of Mass. Tarby stated there is a big difference between that and something that is an apartment. Cassidy noted for the record that the City's zoning ordinance actually defines the term FAMILY as "...one or more persons...", so a household of one would constitute a FAMILY.

Turner inquired that as far as individual assistance, is it the expectation that these individuals will require more medical assistance and therefore not have motor vehicles and they will not be as independent as if they were deemed a continuing care resident? Chris Manning, of LCS Development, stated the typical assisted living resident does not drive and added that they would be in independent living units if they were able to drive.

Seeing no further questions from Board members, Cassidy outlined her draft recommendation letter that she prepared for the Planning Board to submit the City Council regarding Pulte's TBOD Special Permits for Highland at The Vale. In addition to describing the development, Cassidy noted that Pulte's application includes requests for several other special permits, in addition to the one needed for the proposed residential use:

- Provide relief from the requirement that "access to the buildable portion of a lot shall be gained from a lot's legal street only. Access to lots by so-called 'common driveways' or access easements shall be prohibited.";
- Allow certain fences and retaining walls to exceed 3' and 6' in height respectively (Sections 5.3.2. and 5.34. of the WZO respectively); and
- Reduce the minimum roadway pavement width for two-way traffic from 24' to 20' (Section 28.8.3).

Quoting from the draft report, Cassidy stated the Board defers comment on VHB's traffic impact memorandum/trip generation comparison in favor of the Engineering Department which will be submitting its own communication and the Board also defers review of the proposed signage for zoning conformance to the Inspectional Services Department. The application package did not provide any information relative to drainage or stormwater management.

Cassidy stated a major point of issue relates to conformance with the maximum residential density limitation. This is one of two pending special permits seeking approval for construction of residential units in the District, and taken

together they appear to exceed the maximum number of residential units allowed by Section 28.6.2.2 (300 units). A pending Special Permit application from LCS Woburn, LLC calls for construction of 103 congregate elderly housing units and 84 assisted living units. Adding the total number of residential units planned for Pulte and LCS combined appears to equal 384 units. The issue centers on how one “classifies” the 84 assisted living units planned for this project.

The Council must determine whether the aggregate number of residential dwelling units on the two sites meets or exceeds the maximum number of units that can be permitted.

Cassidy informed the Board that Section 28.5 was included to ensure that, with few exceptions, the provisions of the TBOD chapter alone would control development within the District.

The request for relief from the requirement for access to the buildable portion of a lot over its frontage should not be a Special Permit request, but rather an acknowledged waiver/authorization by the City Council, in accordance with Section 28.11.6.1.

Special permits for fence and retaining wall heights are unnecessary, since the TBOD does not limit the height of fences and retaining walls, and given the language at Section 28.5 regarding exclusivity of the TBOD provisions. The Planning Board recommends that all fences exceeding 3’ in height and all segments of retaining walls that exceed 6’ in height be identified on the Plan(s) of Record for future reference by Inspectional Services staff.

The Planning Board does not recommend reducing the minimum roadway pavement width from 24’ to 20’. The request is a desire to maximize the per-acre density of the site and is not dictated by physical site constraints. The access roads are intended to support two-way traffic and the applicant intends to allow parking on the street and the combination of narrower pavement width, on-street parking and seasonal snow banks could create inconvenient situations and unsafe conditions.

Cassidy noted other parking and street related issues and noted the plans provide no cross-sections for any of the driveway/roadways that will provide access to the townhouse units. A detail for these roadways should be added to the plan set.

Cassidy stated the Woburn Municipal Code specifies a minimum clearance of eight (8) feet that will be needed for the vertical clearance on the street signs being proposed at each access road for the townhouse units.

Vertical granite curbing should be required throughout the development rather than the monolithic Cape Cod berm which is being proposed.

Cassidy stated that the streets (ways) in this project must be named after Woburn veterans killed in action, per City ordinance.

In relation to pedestrian and bicycle accommodations, Cassidy discussed that the overall master development plan for the TBOD District includes a number of elements to accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians, including sidewalks on Hill Street and the main interior access road, and an extension of the Tri-Community Bikeway into the site. The proposed site plan for Highland at The Vale does not include any sidewalks on any of the roads providing access to the townhouse units. The driveways around the multi-family buildings also lack sidewalks. There are walkways connecting various parking areas to entrances in the multi-family buildings, but these walkways do not connect to each other. Only one walkway, adjacent to multi-family Building #1, provides a connection to the sidewalk that will be installed on the main roadway servicing this development and LCS’s.

Cassidy noted there is no exterior bicycle storage proposed and the garages servicing the multi-family buildings do not appear to have bike storage areas included in their design. Bike racks should be installed in both the townhouse and multi-unit portions of the project.

Cassidy stated the envisioned development overall, including Pulte and LCS's individual plans, fall short of their potential with respect to pedestrian and bicycle accommodations. The design of the district could be improved to better capitalize on the property's proximity to the Tri-Community Bikeway. The residential portion of the TBOD development should be provided with more robust alternative transportation accommodations, to ensure adequate and safe paths of travel to other parts of the district and off-site destinations.

Cassidy also noted the designs of specific development parcels should incorporate site elements that will accommodate and encourage the use of forms of transportation other than a car; the designs of all projects on the entire site should cohesively work together to ensure the adequate and safe passage of pedestrians and bicyclists throughout the development; and designs and site features should encourage use of alternative transportation methods such as coordinated wayfinding signage throughout the district, pathways that provide complete access for multiple users simultaneously, and separation/demarcation of bicycle lanes to maximize safety against vehicular traffic.

Cassidy noted a trash and recycling area is proposed adjacent to one of the multi-unit buildings and inquired as to if that area is intended to service both the multi-family and townhouse units; does the recycling area also include trash receptacles; how will trash be collected from both types of units; and will residents be responsible for placing their trash in the recycling area themselves, or is a coordinated collection of trash envisioned.

With respect to the townhouse units, the Planning Board recommends the Council consider imposing a formal requirement mandating trash receptacles be kept inside the units' garages for health and aesthetic reasons.

Cassidy noted the plans should be revised to show areas where snow storage will occur as no areas have been included on the plans. The Engineering Department should be asked to verify the adequacy of those areas in terms of their capacity.

There was no additional discussion.

Motion was made by Doherty to accept the Planning Director's recommendation to the City Council regarding the Special Permit application by Pulte Homes of New England LLC for Highland at Vale; Seconded by Turner;

Roll call vote on the motion to accept the Director's recommendation:

Bolgen-Aye
Callahan-Aye
Doherty-Aye
Edmonds-Abstain
Turner-Aye
Ventresca-Aye
Donovan-Aye

Motion carried, 6-0-1 (Edmonds abstained[CT1]).

DISCUSSION / RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL ON TECHNOLOGY AND BUSINESS MIXED USE OVERLAY DISTRICT SPECIAL PERMIT APPLICATIONS (TBOD): The Delaney at the Vale

Cassidy noted most of this discussion will overlap with discussion of the previous application.

Cassidy summarized this application, which seeks special permits pursuant to Section 28.6.2.2. of the Woburn Zoning Ordinance to allow development of 103 congregate elderly housing units, and pursuant to Section 28.6.2.9 to allow for an Extended Care Facility having 84 assisted living units and 36 memory care units.

Dylan Stevens, Stantec Consulting, 226 Causeway Street, Boston, the civil engineers and site planners for the project, shared a visual of the overall layout of The Delaney at the Vale as it is located in the southeast corner of the Overlay

District. Stevens noted 147 of the total 193 parking spaces will be surface spaces and an underground parking garage will hold 46 parking spaces. Additional topics of discussion included: driveway width throughout the site is 24 feet; there is a retaining wall on the property; and there is a continuous walking loop that connects to the pedestrian access on the loop road. Visuals shared during the presentation were from the Site Approval Drawings for The Delaney at the Vale dated 5/1/2020 prepared for LCS Woburn, LLC by Dimella Shaffer Associates, Inc. and Allen & Major Associates, Inc.

Architect Adam Rothers, of Dimella Shaffer Associates, Inc., described the elevation of the project and showed aerial views while explaining the layout of the buildings. All three buildings are 4 stories with one building over a garage.

Bolgen inquired how the build-out on this site will dovetail with the buildout on the Pulte site.

Chris Manning of LCS stated their plan is to begin by the end of this year which will be roughly at the same time the ring road allows them access to their site. Manning stated it will be 22-24 months to complete construction and believes Pulte will be working on their project simultaneously.

Seeing no further discussion, Cassidy summarized her recommendation letter and noted that LCS's application includes requests for several other special permits in accordance with Section 28.3 of the WZO in addition to those needed for the proposed residential uses to: A reduction in the amount of required parking from 281 to 193 (Section 28.8.4. of the WZO); Allowing for certain sections of one (1) retaining wall to exceed 6' in height (Section 5.3.4. of the WZO); Authorization for overnight parking of two (2) passenger vans (Section 5.1(57b) of the WZO); and Relief from the requirement that access to the buildable portion of a lot shall be gained from a lot's legal street only. Access to lots by common driveways or access easements shall be prohibited.

Quoting from the draft report, Cassidy stated the Board deferred comment on Stantec's stormwater management memo and VHB's traffic impact memorandum to the Engineering Department and deferred review of the proposed signage for zoning conformance to the Inspectional Services Department. Cassidy also noted the application package did not include anything related to drainage or storm water management so the Board will not have any comments regarding those issues.

The Planning Board's first major point of issue relates to conformance with the maximum residential density limitation as it appears to exceed the maximum number of residential units allowed by Section 28.6.2.2 (300 units).

A pending Special Permit application from Pulte Homes calls for construction of 197 condominiums on a site adjacent to this development. The 197 units at Pulte, when added to this Petitioner's 103 congregate elderly housing units and 84 assisted living units equals 384 units. The issue centers on how one "classifies" the 84 assisted living units planned for this project.

The Council must determine whether the aggregate number of residential dwelling units on the two sites meets or exceeds the maximum number of units that can be permitted.

Cassidy stated TBOD provisions are stand-alone and Planning staff informed the Board that Section 28.5 was included to ensure that, with few exceptions, the provisions of the TBOD chapter alone would control development within the District.

The request for relief from the requirement for access to the buildable portion of a lot over its frontage should not be a Special Permit request, but rather an acknowledged waiver/authorization by the City Council, in accordance with Section 28.11.6.1.

A special permit for retaining wall height may be unnecessary, since the TBOD does not limit the height of retaining walls and given the language at Section 28.5 regarding exclusivity of the TBOD provisions. The Planning Board recommends the segments of wall that exceed 6' in height be identified on the plan for the Council's information, and that the Building Commissioner be consulted to determine if a special permit is necessary.

Overnight parking of vehicles associated with business operations does not require a special permit. It can be a use permitted by right with site plan review as long as one additional on-site parking space is provided for each such vehicle. Cassidy noted it does not appear that additional spaces have been provided for the vehicles for which permission is being sought as the Petitioner is seeking permission to provide less than the minimum parking the Ordinance requires for the residential and institutional uses.

The Petitioner is seeking a Special Permit to reduce the number of parking spaces provided on-site. The Petition indicates a total of 281 parking spaces are required and seeks a special permit to reduce the number to 193, which would equate to a one-third reduction in the amount of parking. The Board recommends the Petitioner be required to submit a revised summary of conditions at other facilities that includes only those facilities which have been open for at least a year, and which simplifies the information for comprehension purposes. Bedroom counts should be eliminated, since parking for Extended Care Facilities and Congregate Units are computed by unit, not by the number of beds. A total number of units of each type should be included and the parking information simplified by reclassifying covered surface spaces at other facilities as surface spaces.

Cassidy stated parking calculations should be clarified by listing, for each unit type, the number of parking spaces required and proposed to be provided. The table on the cover page has limited utility in that it lists visitor parking twice and provides no information on the number of spaces required by the WZO. The parking "table" on the cover sheet should be revised to mirror the parking table provided on Sheet C-101.

Cassidy stated the overall master development plan for the TBOD District includes a number of elements to accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians, including sidewalks on Hill Street and the main interior access road, and an extension of the Tri-Community Bikeway into the site. The proposed site plan for The Delaney at The Vale shows a pedestrian walkway around the building that winds through several courtyards. However, the walkway does not physically connect with the sidewalk planned for the main interior access road, nor does it connect with any other pedestrian path of travel off the site. There are no crosswalks or bicycle accommodations shown on the Special Permit plans.

The Planning Board has the opinion that the envisioned development overall, and the individual development plans of both Pulte and LCS, fall short of their potential with respect to pedestrian and bicycle accommodations. The design of the district generally could be improved to better capitalize on the property's proximity to the Tri-Community Bikeway, which crosses Hill Street at the entrance to the site. The site development master plan includes a pathway through a portion of the property that will be wide enough to accommodate both bicycle and pedestrian traffic, but it is wide enough to accommodate both only to a point. The shared pathway narrows to a standard sidewalk width at a location well short of the LCS project, and in fact before reaching the Pulte site. The residential portion of the TBOD development should be provided with more robust alternative transportation accommodations, to ensure adequate and safe paths of travel to other parts of the district and off-site destinations.

The designs of specific development parcels should incorporate site elements that will accommodate and encourage the use of forms of alternative transportation. The designs of all projects and of the overall site should cohesively work together to ensure the adequate and safe passage of pedestrians and bicyclists throughout the entire development.

The Planning Board strongly encourages the Council, the Petitioner and Leggat McCall to work together to incorporate into the various project designs additional site features and construction standards that encourage the safe use of alternative transportation methods. Examples include coordinated wayfinding signage throughout the district, pathways that provide complete access for multiple users simultaneously, and separation/demarcation of bicycle lanes to maximize safety against vehicular traffic.

The Board recommends a connection to the sidewalk on the main access driveway; the provision of crosswalks wherever walkways cross driveways (such as at the garage entrance and at the trash/loading area); and installation of one or two outdoor bike racks, in addition to secured bicycle storage in the garage.

All areas identified for snow storage on Sheet C-101 need to be labeled as such and should be reviewed to see if they are of adequate capacity to serve the snow storage needs for the entire lot/parking lot.

The Board recommends the Council consider requiring the Petitioner to provide more detailed landscaping information relative to proposed quantities, species and sizes.

Cassidy stated that the streets (ways) in this project must be named after Woburn veterans killed in action, per City ordinance.

Callahan asked for confirmation that the proposed parking supply on this specific project is deficient and Cassidy confirmed it is.

There was no additional discussion.

Motion was made by Doherty to accept the Planning Director's recommendation to the City Council regarding the Special Permit application by LCS Woburn LLC for the Delaney at The Vale;
Seconded by Ventresca;

Roll call vote on the motion to accept the Director's recommendation:
Motion was made by Doherty to accept the Planning Director's letter of recommendation to the City Council;
Seconded by Ventresca;

Roll call vote on the motion to close the Public Hearing:

Bolgen-Aye
Callahan-Nay
Doherty-Aye
Edmonds-Abstain
Turner-Aye
Ventresca-Aye
Donovan-Aye

Motion carried, 5-1-1 (Callahan against; Edmonds abstained).

FERULLO DRIVE (SHANNON FARM ESTATES) SUBDIVISION

Cassidy stated the developer has requested to release Lot #33 (318 Lexington Street) from the language of the restrictive covenant posted as surety to guarantee project completion. Lots #33 and #34 in this project have adequate frontage on Lexington Street and do not rely on the new subdivision road for legal frontage. As a result, Lot #34 was released from the language of the restrictive covenant in July of 2018, and the developer is now asking that Lot #33 be released from the language of the Covenant so that it may be built upon and sold. The remaining 32 lots would remain under the Covenant for the foreseeable future, until some other form of surety is posted to replace it. The utility easement that runs over this lot has since been accepted by the City so Planning staff recommends release of this lot as requested.

Cassidy continued that Mr. Murray is also requesting an extension of the construction completion date from June 28, 2020 to October 15, 2022. Mr. Murray contends that some of the work to date has been delayed because of National Grid and Eversource scheduling delays that have been further compounded by the COVID-19 State of Emergency. He is seeking an additional 28 months of construction time so that he can complete construction of all 32 homes before installing the final paving on the roadway. Engineering's comment states that 28 months sounds very aggressive as it would require an average of more than one house to be completed every month between now and then. If construction can be completed by October of 2022, it would equate to a total of six years of construction for the neighborhood. Attorney Tarby submitted a detailed list of remaining items to be completed, but Cassidy requested the developer submit a detailed timeline with specific target dates for completion of the project.

Cassidy noted there have been several complaints from various abutters on Strawberry Lane relative to construction impacts. Dust and noise complaints have been received but are not unusual. However, there is an alleged water problem resulting from a possible groundwater breakout from the development site that is under investigation. Cassidy spoke with Mr. Murray on the issue and will schedule a meeting between the City's Engineering, Planning and DPW Departments and the developer. Mr. Murray is concerned that the water problem pre-existed his acquisition of the site and recent construction activities, though he contends he will not shirk responsibility for fixing the problem if it is in fact his.

Callahan stated he would like to see the developer submit a chronological timeline of their conversations with Eversource and National Grid for the utility installation and document how they are going to complete the roadway. He would like them to submit a detailed timeline, commit to it in writing, and only grant an extension of time for the roadwork only. Callahan stated there should be no release of covenant for lots until all roadway work is complete.

Cassidy stated most developers try to build all houses before they complete the roadway so as to minimize damage to the new road surface. She will try to obtain a very detailed timeline that will include the Eversource and National Grid work to be done.

Attorney Tarby stated the gas strike caused a delay in utility installation and provided detail on additional field work that has been completed to date.

Ventresca emphasized the need for a detailed and very realistic timeline. Ventresca noted he has witnessed progress on the site recently and stated he will try to observe the groundwater issue on Strawberry Lane. Ventresca also questioned if the Winning Farm development is contributing to the groundwater issue

Tarby stated City Engineer Jay Corey has been aware of the groundwater problem for years.

Cassidy recommended that the Board release Lot #33 from the language of the restrictive covenant posted as surety to guarantee completion of the Ferullo Drive subdivision and table discussion on extending the construction completion date to the next meeting on July 21, 2020.

Motion was made by Doherty to accept the Planning Director's recommendation;
Seconded by Bolgen;

Roll call vote on the motion:

Bolgen-Aye
Callahan-Aye
Doherty-Aye
Edmonds-Aye
Turner-Aye
Ventresca-Aye
Donovan-Aye

Motion carried, 7-0-0.

SUBDIVISIONS:

12 BUCKMAN COURT:

The developers of this one-lot subdivision hope to replace the covenant currently posted as surety with a Letter of Credit so that a building permit can be issued and the lot can be sold. The Engineering Department reviewed their request to set a bond amount, and recommends the bond be set at \$139,884.47. The Letter of Credit is currently being reviewed by the City Solicitor.

Cassidy recommends the Board vote to accept the letter of credit as long as the form of the letter of credit is found to be acceptable to/by the City Solicitor.

Motion by Doherty to accept the Director's recommendation;
Seconded by Edmonds;

Callahan inquired about the expiration date on the Letter of Credit. Cassidy stated she does not feel comfortable with an expiration date on a bond and said she awaits the Solicitor's comments on that point.

Bolgen questioned the way the recommendation and motion was framed, specifically, setting the bond amount is one action, but what if the Letter of Credit is not acceptable to the City Solicitor? Discussion continued about the Letter of Credit and the Solicitor's pending review. The motion, if passed, would allow the City Solicitor, if she deemed necessary, request and require the bank to revise some language in the letter. Some Board members expressed discomfort with having to vote on a document that is not in its final version with the potential of possibly putting the City at risk.

Ventresca suggested splitting the recommendation in two parts.

Doherty withdrew his motion to accept the Director's original recommendation.
Edmonds withdrew his second.

Cassidy recommended the Board vote to set the amount of surety needed to guarantee completion of the 12 Buckman Court subdivision at \$139,884.47.

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

Roll call vote on the motion to set surety amount for 12 Buckman Court:

Bolgen-Aye
Callahan-Aye
Doherty-Aye
Edmonds-Aye
Turner-Aye
Ventresca-Aye
Donovan-Aye

Motion carried, 7-0-0.

Cassidy discussed options regarding accepting a final surety for 12 Buckman Court noting the developer is hoping to begin construction soon. The Board decided, if necessary, they may be willing to hold a special virtual meeting to review and vote on an acceptable Letter of Credit if the developer submits one and the Solicitor indicates her approval of it.

WRITTEN PROGRESS REPORTS FROM DEVELOPERS REGARDING CONSTRUCTION COMPLETION DATE EXPIRATION

CARLSON WAY AND RUSSO ESTATES SUBDIVISIONS: Written reports regarding progress toward construction completion / Developers Bryan Melanson and Bill Scire, respectively

Cassidy stated a short-term decision has been made to request written updates from developers of pending subdivisions, in lieu of attendance at a meeting for formal Board discussions and votes on extending construction completion dates.

The Carlson Way subdivision completion date expired on June 15, 2020. At the end of May, Melanson said he would need until the middle of July to complete the project. An update will be provided on the July 21, 2020 meeting.

The Russo Estates construction completion date also expired on June 15th. Attorney Salvati contacted the office to say his client needed additional time to prepare the update and will provide one for the July 21, 2020 meeting.

Cassidy explained that no formal action by the Board was needed relative to these updates.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: June 2, 2020 regular meeting.

Chair Donovan asked if members had reviewed the draft minutes of the last meeting and whether anyone was prepared to offer a motion to accept them.

Motion to accept the June 2, 2020 meeting minutes, as submitted, made by Callahan;
Seconded by Doherty;

Roll call vote on the motion to accept the June 2, 2020 meeting minutes, as submitted:

Bolgen-Aye
Callahan-Aye
Doherty-Aye
Edmonds-Abstain
Turner-Aye
Ventresca-Aye
Donovan-Aye

Motion carried, 6-0-1 (Edmonds Abstain).

PLANNING BOARD DIRECTOR UPDATE:

Next agenda will include the continuation of two Public Hearings regarding definitive subdivisions at 316 New Boston Street and 0 (Off) New Boston Street in addition to a Public Hearing for the 3 Sherman Terrace Definitive Subdivision application. There will also be a citizens petition to make Tower Office Park Drive a Public Way.

Chair Donovan asked Cassidy if there was any other business for the Board to conduct this evening and Cassidy stated no.

ADJOURNMENT

Seeing no further business, Bolgen made a motion made to adjourn the June 2, 2020 Planning Board meeting at 9:09 pm;
Seconded by Turner;

Roll call vote on the motion to adjourn June 23, 2020 Planning Board meeting at 9:09 pm:

Bolgen-Aye
Callahan-Aye
Doherty-Aye
Edmonds-Aye
Turner-Aye
Ventresca-Aye
Donovan-Aye

Motion carried, 7-0-0.

Table of Documents Used and/or Referenced at Meeting

| |
|---|
| Planning Board Staff Report (June 23, 2020 meeting) |
| Staff Report Attachment (TBOD): |
| Attachment A: Highland at Vale / Pulte Homes: April 30, 2020 cover letter from Civil Design Group, LLC (which in part contains a list of “relief” needed from various Sections of the Woburn Zoning Ordinance [WZO]); The Special Permit/Site Plan Review application (received by the Planning Board on May 12, 2020); May 4, 2020 Traffic Impact Memorandum/Trip Generation Comparison from VHB to Mr. Chad Reynolds, Sr. Vice President of Leggat McCall Properties; Signage Location Plan (9 sheets) by Civil Design Group, LLC; Architectural Plans for Highland At Vale (27 sheets) by Civil Design Group, LLC; and Site Plan for Highland At Vale (multiple sheets by multiple parties); Draft Letter of Comments to the City Council; |
| Attachment B: The Delaney at The Vale / LCS Montvale LLC: The Special Permit/ Site Plan Review application (received by the Planning Board on May 19, 2020); May 6, 2020 Traffic Impact Memorandum/Trip Generation Comparison from VHB to Mr. Chris Manning, Project Development Manager, LCS Development; May 6, 2020 memorandum from Stantec to Woburn City Council regarding The Delaney at the Vale – Stormwater Management Memo; Sheet of “Project Data” dated 4.29.20 entitled “Delaney Rental IL/AL/MC Community”; June 17, 2020 Letter from Stantec to Mr. Chris Manning of LCS regarding senior housing parking investigation; and 27-sheet plan set of Site Approval Drawings; Draft Letter of Comments to the City Council. |
| Attachment C: Ferullo Drive / Murray Hills: Proposed Release of Covenant; Developer’s Letter of Request; Engineering memo regarding extension request; Resident letters from Strawberry Lane regarding groundwater issues. |
| Attachment D: Buckman Court / Nardone Electric: Draft Letter of Credit; Developer’s Letter of Request; Engineering Department comment letter; |
| Staff Report Attachments (Various subdivisions) (1) Staff letters to developers requesting status updates on the Carlson Way and Russo Estates subdivisions; |
| Draft Meeting Minutes: June 2, 2020 meeting |

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Smith

Karen Smith
Planner