

# APPROVED

## MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, May 25, 2021 Woburn Planning Board Meeting | 7:00 p.m.

*\*\*Meeting held virtually via Zoom Platform\*\**

Chair pro tem Claudia Bolgen called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm and asked City Planner Karen Smith to call the roll.

Ms. Claudia Bolgen, Mr. Jim Callahan, Mr. Bob Doherty, Mr. Dave Edmonds, Ms. Carolyn Turner, and Mr. Michael Ventresca were in attendance; Chair Kevin Donovan was absent. Planning Director Tina Cassidy and City Planner/Grant Writer Dan Orr were also in attendance.

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

### **PUBLIC HEARING: PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 5.2.4 OF THE WOBURN ZONING ORDINANCES ADDING LANGUAGE AUTHORIZING TEMPORARY RELIEF FROM REQUIREMENT FOR ACCESS OVER A LOT'S FRONTAGE DURING ROADWAY CONSTRUCTION (Alderman Ed Tedesco)**

Cassidy provided an overview of the proposed zoning amendment before the Board relative to currently required access over the frontage of a building lot. The rezoning proposal was proposed in response to the concerns of a property owner in the New Boston Street Corridor whose driveway will be made non-conforming during the period of upcoming roadway/bridge reconstruction. The proposal would serve to prevent the creation of a zoning non-conformity for the duration of project construction. She added that the proposed zoning language was drafted by the City Solicitor, and the Planning Board Director and Building Commissioner provided input.

Cassidy further reviewed the proposed language (addition of two sentences) that comprise the zoning amendment and stated that her staff recommendation would be to recommend City Council adoption of the amendment, as drafted, following the conclusion of the public hearing on this matter.

Bolgen opened this matter for a public hearing and turned to Cassidy to explain the logistics of using the “raised hand” function to identify audience members who wish to speak.

### **PUBLIC HEARING**

Bolgen asked Cassidy if any members of the audience wished to address the Board on this matter. No members of the audience indicated a desire to speak.

Seeing no members of the audience indicating a desire to speak, Edmonds made a motion to close the public hearing; Seconded by Doherty;

Roll call vote on the motion to close the public hearing for the matter of the proposed amendment to Section 5.2.4 of the Woburn Zoning Ordinances (WZO):

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

The motion carried, 6-0-0.

Motion to accept the Planning Director's recommendation to recommend City Council adoption of the proposed amendment to Section 5.2.4 of the WZO, as drafted, made by Edmonds;  
Seconded by Doherty;

Roll call vote on the motion to accept the Planning Director's aforementioned recommendation to approve the proposed amendment to Section 5.2.4 of the WZO:

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

The motion carried, 6-0-0.

**PUBLIC HEARING: SPECIAL PERMIT MODIFICATION REQUEST FOR 225 WILDWOOD AVENUE PURSUANT TO SECTION 5.1 (40BB), TO AUTHORIZE AN ADDITIONAL 9,500 +/- SQ. FT. OF HEAVY MANUFACTURING FLOOR SPACE (Lake Shore Cryotronics, Inc. and American ULT Cryogenics, LLC, d/b/a Janis ULT)**

Cassidy summarized the Petition before the Board to modify the special permit to increase the amount of allowable heavy manufacturing space on site from 23,800-square feet to 33,266-square feet, pursuant to the Planning Board's special permit granting authority pertaining to heavy manufacturing uses greater than 15,000-square feet. If approved, the site plan would be modified to reallocate the amount of allowable heavy manufacturing space between the two (2) Petitioners and increase the amount of required parking by thirteen (13) parking spaces.

Attorney Joseph Tarby, Rubin & Rudman, addressed the Board on behalf of the Petitioner to provide an overview of the application and the purpose of the filing, which is to modify a Special Permit issued by the Planning Board on February 13, 2014, and subsequently modified on April 23, 2014 and August 19, 2020.

Tarby provided additional information relative to the allocation of manufacturing space at the property, which will result in a net increase in heavy manufacturing space (of 9,466-square feet) above the amount previously authorized by the Board. He continued to summarize the tenants' industry activities (designing and fabricating cryogenic laboratory equipment), the manufacturing process, compliance with parking requirements, and the historic uses within the facility.

Tarby provided additional information relative to the number of onsite employees, weekly pickups/deliveries, and a description of the commercial vehicles used during the pickup/delivery process.

Callahan asked about the nature of waste that will be generated by the manufacturing process. Tarby asked Mr. Tom Pasakarnis, Chairman and CFO of American Cryogenics, LLC, to introduce himself to the Board and answer members' questions. Pasakarnis stated that there's a minimal amount of waste generated onsite. The waste is collected once approximately every six (6) to twelve (12) months and typically consists of a partially filled drum and smaller containers containing hazardous materials. He added that American Cryogenics must document and report every hazardous material-related activity conducted onsite to the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority (MWRA).

Edmonds asked about the status of meeting ADA requirements for parking at the site given the increase in parking spaces. Tarby stated that he is not certain of whether that requirement has been met. Cassidy added that it is the intent of the Building Commissioner to review a formally filed floor use plan to make a determination of compliance

with parking accessibility requirements. She added that Attorney Tarby has supplied some preliminary floor area calculations, but a formal floor plan is forthcoming.

Cassidy asked Attorney Tarby for clarity on the representation of heavy manufacturing space used at the facility. She explained that her analysis of the preliminary floor use calculations appears to be at odds with the amount of total heavy manufacturing space mentioned in the Petition, due to the space utilized by an additional tenant (Primaira) not referenced in the Petition. Attorney Tarby responded that the subject tenants (Lake Shore Cryogenics and American ULT Cryogenics) were only referenced in the Petition, as only their leasing activities are being modified and that Primaira is an existing tenant. Pasakarnis added that Primaira's manufacturing activity is not considered a "heavy" manufacturing use.

Turner asked Pasakarnis for additional information relative to the location of hazardous material storage and more information as to any changes to the volume of hazardous material storage resulting from the increase in manufacturing activity. Pasakarnis responded that hazardous materials are properly stored on the interior of the building for insurance liability purposes and that company staff is well-trained on adhering to storage regulations. He added that he does not anticipate any increase in the amount of hazardous materials due to the nature of the reallocation of manufacturing activity.

Bolgen asked if there were any additional questions from the Board. There were none.

Bolgen opened this matter for a public hearing and explained the logistics of using the "raised hand" function to audience members.

#### PUBLIC HEARING

Bolgen asked Cassidy if any members of the audience wished to address the Board on this matter. No members of the audience indicated a desire to speak.

Bolgen asked Cassidy if she had any thoughts on a Board action to close the public hearing and whether it would be ideal to take such action now. Cassidy responded that the Board should consider waiting to close the hearing until a required formal floor plan is submitted by the Petitioner, as recommended by the Building Commissioner. She continued by reviewing the options before the Board relative to closing or continuing of the public hearing (with or without issuing a Decision this evening).

Bolgen asked if there were any downsides to a public hearing closure or continuance. Cassidy responded that leaving the public hearing open would enable the Board to consider additional information that may have an impact on their final Decision at an upcoming June meeting. She further clarified that only confirmatory information can be submitted in the form of a new document if the public hearing has been closed.

Bolgen asked about a scenario in which the Planning Board closes the public hearing and subsequently learns that a floor plan was submitted with a zoning discrepancy. Cassidy responded that it would be the responsibility of the applicant to rectify the situation, and it would be within the authority of the Board to deny the special permit request based on such discrepancy. She added that the Board may also consider the option of an interim Planning Board meeting earlier in June with the expectation that a formal floor plan would be submitted by that point but that it could be further modified, if need be, in time for secondary review by the June 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting.

Tarby stated that he would be in favor of a continuance of this matter to June 8<sup>th</sup> to take advantage of an interim June meeting option.

Cassidy stated that a meeting on June 8<sup>th</sup> may be too early to accommodate another potential Planning Board matter that she would like to address at an interim June meeting, if that option is chosen. Discussion ensued about the timing and Board preferences for an upcoming June meeting.

Ventresca asked for clarification about the applicant's personal timing constraints. Pasakarnis responded that the Petitioner is hoping to coordinate the sale of the property and to finalize a more precise floor plan with the Board's required timeline for issuing its Decision on the modification request.

Ventresca asked if June 15<sup>th</sup> would be ideal as the next Planning Board meeting date instead of June 22<sup>nd</sup> and expressed that he would like to keep the public hearing open. Cassidy and Smith responded to confirm that upcoming public hearings could all be held/advertised for June 15<sup>th</sup>, if that option is chosen.

Bolgen asked for clarification of the expiration of the State of Emergency, continued accommodation of a virtual meeting on June 15<sup>th</sup> and the logistics of a meeting at City Hall. Cassidy responded that guidance from the City Solicitor on this matter indicates that meetings scheduled on June 15<sup>th</sup> may still be held virtually, but that meetings after that date will have to be in person. She added that additional time to plan for an upcoming in-person meeting would be ideal for Planning Board staff, as well.

Motion to continue the public hearing on the matter of the 225 Wildwood Avenue special permit application to June 15, 2021, at 7:00 pm, made by Ventresca;  
Seconded by Turner;

Roll call vote on the motion to accept the Planning Director's recommendation to continue the public hearing on the matter of the 225 Wildwood Avenue special permit application to June 15, 2021, at 7:00 pm.

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

The motion carried, 6-0-0.

**SUBDIVISIONS: WRITTEN CONSTRUCTION COMPLETION PROGRESS REPORTS (88-92 PEARL STREET & 12 BUCKMAN COURT)**

Cassidy provided a summary of the letter provided by Mr. Douglas Ahearn, the developer of 88-92 Pearl Street. She indicated that the developer submitted a letter in April noting imminent installation of granite curbing, final landscaping, street trees, and final coat of roadway pavement, all to be completed by June 15<sup>th</sup>. She added that as-built and street acceptance plans were not included in the developer's letter, however.

Edmonds stated that although he is recused from decision-making as an abutter, he wanted to clarify for the record that the construction update provided by the developer of 88-92 Pearl Street is inaccurate based on his knowledge of the site. Cassidy responded that she appreciates Edmonds first-hand information and that she will ask the developer to address this observation as part of its upcoming in-person update the Board in June.

Bolgen stated that the Board may want to consider re-evaluating its policy of not issuing subdivision completion dates at this time given the outstanding work at Pearl Street and the mid-June expiration of the Governor's State of Emergency.

Ventresca stated that he would be in favor of reverting to the prior Board practice requiring in-person updates and extension requests.

Edmonds stated in addition to coming to the Board, he would like to require that developers submit picture documentation of recent construction to verify construction progress for subdivision projects.

Callahan stated that he believes that developers have at times taken advantage of delays in relation to utility installation and the timing of the pandemic, and lumber prices may be the next factor used to justify timeline extensions. He added that the Board should still hold developers accountable to their original timing commitments, which should not account for project profitability.

Bolgen asked for clarification of the number of subdivisions still considered active and must technically come back before the Board for formal extensions of expired completion dates. Cassidy responded that she can think of approximately six (6) to eight (8) subdivisions falling into this category. She added that staff has preliminarily considered how these subdivisions should be presented to the Board, which may be to require that developers attend in-person meetings beginning in the fall (with potentially two subdivisions being discussed at each subsequent meeting until all have been addressed) and prioritizing those that may be most problematic.

Bolgen stated that she would like to consider the approach of contacting all applicants uniformly to require a subdivision completion date extension and explain the process/deadline for doing so, rather than bringing all developers of expired subdivisions to the Board in an individual fashion.

Cassidy stated that Planning staff have a standard process for taking expired subdivisions/completion date extensions, which in the past has included a request letter, clarification of work completed, revised timeline for completion and input/inspectional action from the Engineering Department to verify work completed and to comment on the feasibility of the revised construction timeline. She added that staff can take the approach of sending all developers a Board-issued letter over the summer explaining the requirement for submitting a completion date extension request and written construction updates for all outstanding subdivisions, along with a potential September 1<sup>st</sup> deadline for a response.

Callahan stated that he would be in support of immediately sending a completion date request to all outstanding developers with a deadline to respond with thirty (30) days of receipt of the letter, at which point the Board can select a date for all developers to attend a designated Planning Board meeting.

Doherty stated that his concern is that developers are able to miss deadlines for completion without any ramifications. He stated that he would be in support of the issuance of a cease and desist order (or other method of penalizing delayed developers) so that the Planning Board has more enforcement authority. Cassidy responded that she is not sure that penalizing developers by preventing more construction progress would be the ultimate goal of the Board. She added that it may be appropriate to rescind subdivision approval from the developer, although this would create a scenario in which construction work would only be made possible by City involvement.

Doherty stated that the Board should consider to the extent possible actions that would more effectively prompt developers to reach out to the Planning Board proactively with regard to requesting completion date extensions, which may be a warning of issuing a cease and desist order. Cassidy responded that she can take that approach into consideration, but she would want to ensure that it is clear that such an action is tied to non-compliance with the Planning Board's conditions of approval.

Bolgen stated that she would like to consider the perspective of staff relative to requiring a written progress report. Cassidy stated that staff can accommodate that approach administratively, with the customary assistance of the Engineering Department, with the intent to give explicit direction to developers to respond by September 1<sup>st</sup>.

Edmonds asked if the Board retains any authority to issue any fines to address the expiration of subdivision completion dates. Cassidy stated that she does not believe such authority exists, but she can explore the topic of issuing fines, and authority for penalties generally, with the City Solicitor.

Ventresca stated that the Board has explored the issue of issuing penalties in the past, but it was determined that no such authority exists. He believes that questioning the developers in-person brings more direct awareness to the developer regarding the timing of construction.

Bolgen reiterated that the question before the Board, now that there appears to be consensus on reinstating a policy of requiring subdivision extension requests, is to ask how staff can accommodate enforcement of that policy feasibly and consistently over the next several months and asked Cassidy for her thoughts. Cassidy stated that staff can commit to requesting written updates, progress reports, and newly-estimated completion dates/timeline for completion within thirty (30) days. With all updates in hand, staff will forward the updates to the Engineering Department for review of new construction timeline information and for site inspections. Once a response from Engineering staff is obtained, staff can arrange a special in-person summer or early September meeting (depending on Board preference and personal schedules) to hold an official in-person meeting focused on addressing outstanding subdivisions.

Members settled on September 1<sup>st</sup> as a deadline for developers' response for submitting extension request letters. Cassidy clarified that a formal vote is not required on this matter.

Bolgen turned to the matter of a subdivision status update for 12 Buckman Court and asked if any information would be presented this evening.

Attorney Tarby addressed the Board on this matter and indicated that he spoke with his client. Following the sale of the property, the new property owner will not be pursuing a build-out of the subdivision. He stated that he will research whether any further action must be taken to formally rescind the approval of the subdivision and the recorded endorsement of the subdivision plan. Cassidy responded that she is not aware of any necessary action but would take any upcoming advisement from Attorney Tarby into consideration.

**RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL: SITE PLAN REVIEW WITH SPECIAL PERMIT APPLICATIONS FOR 60,206 SQ. FT. MEDICAL OFFICE BUILDING AT FORMER KRAFT SITE ON HILL STREET (Mass General Brigham Integrated Care, Inc. Montvale Land LLC, c/o Leggat McCall Properties)**

Attorney Glenn Wood, representing the Petitioner, presented the proposed site plan and architectural renderings to the Board via PowerPoint presentation. He introduced two other individuals present on behalf of the Petitioner, including Mr. John Fernandez, President of Mass General Eye and Ear/Mass General Brigham Integrated Care, Inc. and Mr. Justin Mosca, project engineer of VHB. Wood continued to present an overview of the purpose and scope of the filing.

Wood summarized the subject special permits requirements for the project, as presented, including those for a general outpatient care and diagnostic facility, landscaping, off-site parking, and property setbacks/frontage.

Mr. Justin Mosca, project engineer with VHB, provided an overview of the overall project design and an explanation of the vehicular access to the site, the landscaping components, retaining wall height, and setbacks for the proposed utility equipment/bike rack. He added that an additional special permit will be sought from the City Council relative to Section 5.2.1.4, for access to the lot not being over its frontage.

Mr. John Fernandez, President of Mass General Eye and Ear/Mass General Brigham Integrated Care, Inc., reviewed the outpatient medical service activities that will be offered at the facility, including ambulatory care.

Mosca presented the civil, environmental and traffic engineering components of the project to the Board. He reviewed the site location (including leasing area), existing conditions and MWRA easement locations. He also explained the various aspects of the proposed outpatient facility and parking lot features. He highlighted the placement of building terraces, utility equipment, loading facilities, utility lines, and roadway access for fire safety, all of which having been reviewed and indicated to not have raised any concerns during meetings with pertinent City Department Heads.

Mosca continued to his review by highlighting landscaping components and non-vehicular connections/pedestrian mobility features of the site layout. He also provided an overall review of the environmentally-sensitive design

features of the project, including water conservation, stormwater management, and energy use, which are in accordance with LEED Gold design. He concluded his presentation and turned the presentation over to Fernandez

Fernandez explained the ancillary community benefits of the project, including better healthcare access, construction jobs, and economic activity. He provided an overview of the project timeline, which projects an April 2023 facility opening date, and concluded his presentation.

Attorney Wood stated that he and other Petitioner representatives are available for Board questioning.

Callahan asked for clarification relative to tractor trailer access and turning radii, as well as safe bicycle access to the bike racks. Mosca responded that the design has been reviewed for accommodation of 40-foot tractor trailers, although mostly box trucks are expected. He added that bicycles would access the bikes storage racks via the main driveway.

Ventresca stated that he is concerned with the installation of the temporary parking facility and would like to see a time limit placed on this feature. He added his agreement with ensuring that tractor trailer radii are sufficiently addressed/considered.

Edmonds stated that he does not think the site plan has a sufficient level of safety relative to truck maneuverability based on his professional review of similar site plans. He would like to see a different arrangement that does not require trucks to pull into the standard vehicle parking area before entering the loading dock area.

Bolgen asked for additional information regarding user access to the site's green space, in addition to the extent to which ADA accessibility has been incorporated into the broader design of the building grounds. Mosca responded that there is at least one crosswalk and other pathways that do not appear on the rendering of the site plan (adjacent to the parking garage) and that consideration has been given to ensure maximum accessibility within standard pathways (over which the Petitioner has control) to the building and amenity areas in recognition of required elevation/distance thresholds.

Mr. Ian Downing, landscape architect with Mikyong Kim Design, spoke on behalf of the Petitioner to represent that due consideration has been given to the materiality (e.g., settling of pavers over time) of public spaces and access areas to ensure maximum accessibility over time.

Callahan asked for clarification of the details and timing of the temporary parking lot. Mosca responded that the temporary parking lot will be comprised of finished materials, including asphalt pavement and curbing. However, landscaping will be more minimal in nature in comparison to typical long-term permanent parking lots. He added that the timing of the removal of the temporary parking lot/construction of the parking garage is dependent on other factors in the landowner's development of the overall master plan for "The Vale."

Edmonds asked for a clarification of the width of the drive aisles, parking space configuration and ADA accessibility within the temporary parking lot. Mosca responded that the width of the parking lot aisles is 24-feet and parking spaces will meet the City's standard of 18-feet in length. He also highlighted all accessible parking spaces and access aisles for both parking lots surrounding the facility for members' information.

Ventresca asked for clarification of where the parking garage will be located. Mosca highlighted the location of the temporary parking lot and future parking garage and assured that all required parking will remain available during each subsequent phase of construction.

Turner asked for clarification of the distance between the parking garage to the entrance of the medical building. Mosca replied that the distance is approximately 650 feet.

Callahan asked about the grade differential between the parking garage and the entrance to the main building. Mosca responded that he is not certain of the precise grading differential, but he would estimate three (3) feet based on his review of other adjacent grading.

Bolgen asked if the members had any additional questions on this matter. There were none.

Bolgen asked if the Planning Director had a recommendation to share on this matter. Cassidy stated that the draft comment letter provided to the Board comprises her recommendation in draft form and indicated that if members had any feedback based on discussion this evening she would incorporate such revisions prior to finalizing it and submitting it to the City Council on the Board's behalf. She continued by reminding members that the deadline for submitting comments is May 31<sup>st</sup> and that any feedback members are able to provide this evening would be helpful in meeting that deadline. She added that the draft recommendations have been reviewed by other Department head colleagues, who did not register any concerns.

Edmonds stated that he would like to address the delivery truck accessibility to loading docks, in particular regarding the pathway of larger tractor trailer trucks prior to backing into a loading bay. He would like to urge the Council to look more into the design of this configuration. Cassidy responded that she would be sure to address Edmonds' concern in a revised version of the draft letter that she will then circulate to members for secondary comments.

Callahan stated that he is concerned with the potential queuing of truck traffic and the lack of accommodation for such queuing. He would appreciate the Council's consideration of this fact in reviewing the site plan.

Ventresca stated that he believes there should be more clarification regarding the number of years that the temporary surface parking lot will be in existence. Cassidy responded that, based on conversation with Leggatt McCall representatives, the timing of the temporary surface parking lot is partially based on market conditions. However, they have early indication (based on market demand) that the three (3) to five (5) year timeline is realistic relative to construction of future buildings and removal of the temporary parking lot. She added that the developer represented that they intend to work with the Council to obtain its approval of a modification to the approved Master Concept Plan for the site during the Summer.

Cassidy stated that members may consider wording that would require the Petitioner to explain future changes to the timeline for removal of the temporary parking lot. Ventresca responded that he would like the term "temporary" to be concretely defined and would agree with notion of requiring the Petitioner to return to the Council for any modification to that timeline.

Cassidy stated that she can add specificity to the term "temporary" to reflect members' comments and she would overall recommended Board adoption of a revised letter, incorporating the three (3) amendments mentioned this evening, to be circulated for final review by Board members.

Motion to accept the Planning Director's recommendation on the matter of Hill Street Site Plan Review/Special Permit Application, made by Ventresca;  
Seconded by Turner;

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

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

The motion carried, 6-0-0.

## **PLANNING BOARD DIRECTOR UPDATE**

Cassidy stated that the Lord Hobo special permit filing has been withdrawn, without prejudice, and will not appear as a continued public hearing at the next meeting.

Cassidy stated that there will be two public hearings held at the next meeting relative to rooftop dining and outdoor public seating.

Cassidy further stated staff will endeavor to seek updates on the subdivisions of Borselli Drive and Crossman Road. Bolgen responded that she believes that it would be ideal for staff to forego further subdivision updates until construction updates are solicited and obtained collectively by September 1<sup>st</sup>, as discussed.

Bolgen stated that, unless otherwise stipulated or advised, the Planning Board's next meeting will now occur on Tuesday, June 15, 2021.

Turner stated that she would be supportive of a new policy that would require developers to return to the Planning Board within 30-60 days of the expiration of a subdivision completion date. Bolgen responded that she believes such a policy can be considered but there is a bigger conversation to be had regarding developer accountability to conditions of approval. She added that the Planning Board may have the effect of being more emphatic during the initial review/approval phase of a specific subdivision project.

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES: April 27, 2021 (virtual) meeting**

Bolgen asked if any members had any revisions to suggest to the draft minutes. There were none suggested.

Motion to accept the draft April 27, 2021 (virtual) meeting minutes, as presented, made by Doherty;  
Seconded by Ventresca;

Roll call vote on the motion to accept the draft April 27, 2021 meeting minutes, as presented:

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

The motion carried, 6-0-0.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Bolgen asked if there was any other business for the Board to conduct and there was none.

Seeing no further business, Doherty made a motion to adjourn the May 25, 2021 Planning Board meeting at 9:18 pm;  
Seconded by Turner;

Roll call vote on the motion to adjourn the May 25, 2021 Planning Board meeting, at 9:18 pm:

Callahan-Aye  
Doherty-Aye

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

The motion carried, 6-0-0.

The meeting adjourned at 9:18 p.m.

*Table of Documents Used and/or Referenced at Meeting*

Proposed Amendment to Section 5.2.4 of the Woburn Zoning Ordinances: Copy of text of the proposed amendment
225 Wildwood Avenue Special Permit Modification: (1) Copy of special permit Petition and proposed site plan; (2) Department head comments; (3) Product manufacturing brochure
Technology & Business Mixed-Use Overlay District Special Permit/Site Plan application (Mass General Brigham): (1) Application filing and proposed site plan; (2) Summary of project permits and approvals; (3) Traffic Impact Memorandum (prepared by VHB); (4) Copies of previous Board comments made in connection with past applications; (5) Draft recommendation letter for issuance to the City Council
88-921 Pearl Street definitive subdivision: Copies of construction update letters from developer (dated April 2021 and December 2020)
Draft Meeting Minutes: April 27, 2021 (virtual) meeting

Respectfully submitted,

*Dan Orr*

Dan Orr  
City Planner/Grant Writer