APPROVED
MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, December 8, 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 City Planner Karen Smith to call the roll.

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

It was announced that Bolgen will serve as Chair pro tem because Chairman Donovan was absent for one segment of the public hearings on both the 316 and 0 New Boston Street definitive plan filings.

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

PUBLIC HEARING: 316 NEW BOSTON STREET DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION (DM Five, Inc.)

Cassidy provided an overview of the status of the application and reiterated the proposal to create an industrial subdivision on approximately 19 acres by constructing a 600-foot roadway with a dead-end cul-de-sac. She stated that the public hearing on this matter has been open since July of this year, with monthly continuances since that time. As of this evening, an additionally revised subdivision plan has been submitted for Board review, which incorporates comments from the abutting property owner's consulting engineer as well as revisions that served to eliminate several of the previously-requested waivers such as water line looping and roadway grading. She added that her recommendation to the Board has been updated to take the latest plan revisions and conversation with the applicant's legal counsel into account.

Attorney Joseph Tarby, Rubin & Rudman, LLP, 53 State St, Boston, MA, began to address the Board on behalf of the Petitioner to explain that a prior proposed condition that would have required the applicant to return to the Board for a plan modification relative to reflecting a revised roadway layout for the reconfiguration of New Boston Street has been eliminated, as it is not technically a legal requirement based on subdivision case law. He added that the plan has been additionally revised based on abutter feedback and then turned to the project engineer to provide an overview of revisions.

Mr. Brian McCarthy, project engineer of R.J. O'Connell & Associates, 80 Montvale Avenue # 201, Stoneham, MA, began to address the Board on behalf of the Petitioner. He stated that modifications such as the relocation of a proposed groundwater monitoring well, the addition of curbing detail information, clarification of grass channel maintenance responsibility, and calculations indicating the rate of stormwater receding completely from the grass channel (13 hours, which is well below the required 72 hours) have all been incorporated into revised application materials.

Bolgen asked Attorney Tarby if he had any additional information to provide to the Board at this time. Attorney Tarby responded that he did not.

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. Cassidy explained the function to the audience.

PUBLIC HEARING

Bolgen asked Cassidy if any members of the public had indicated in interest in addressing the Board. No members of the audience indicated a desire to speak.

APPROVED

Bolgen asked the Planning Director if she would recommend that the public hearing be closed at this time. Cassidy responded that she believes that the Board has obtained all of the necessary information resulting from the public hearing and that it would be appropriate for members to close the hearing at this time.

Bolgen called for a motion to close the 316 New Boston Street definitive subdivision plan public hearing.

Motion to close the 316 New Boston Street definitive subdivision public hearing, made by Doherty;
Seconded by Callahan;

Roll call vote on the motion to close the public hearing on the 316 New Boston Street definitive subdivision application:

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

The motion carried, 6-0-1 (Donovan abstained due to absence at a prior segment of the public hearing).

Bolgen asked Cassidy for her recommendation. Cassidy indicated that she would recommend approval of the subdivision, with acceptance of one waiver and denial of another waiver, subject to ten (10) overall proposed conditions.

Cassidy further stated that she would recommend granting the waiver for the installation of a fire alarm system in the roadway (Chapter IV, Section G.9) after speaking with the Fire Department and verifying that such a system is now considered obsolete and that the new fire safety method should instead be based on the installation of individuals alarm systems in each proposed building.

Cassidy further stated that she would further recommend denial of the second wavier relative to roadway slope (Chapter IV, Section G.1), given that the rationale for the waiver request appears to be based on a lack of clarity on the slope standard. She added that she spoke with Engineering staff, who verified that the proposed roadway must be constructed with a curb-to-curb slope of 3/8" per linear foot.

Cassidy stated the ten (10) recommended conditions of subdivision approval, for the record:

1. The required cross slope for the roadway shall be 3/8", and the notation on Sheet C-2C (stating that the roadway cross slope will be at whichever slope is directed by the City Engineer) shall be eliminated prior to plan endorsement;

2. Although all buildings in the subdivision must be equipped with fire alarm system(s) approved by the Fire Department, no fire alarm system/provisions for same shall be not be required within the roadway right of way. Therefore, the fire alarm conduit in the roadway's utility duct bank should be deleted from the plan, and the related notation relative to coordinating its installation with the Fire Chief should also be deleted;

3. Prior to endorsement of the subdivision plan, the developer must provide to the Board copies of acceptable drainage-related easement documents which obligate the landowner(s), his/their successors and assignees to adequately maintain and repair all elements of the drainage system that are not within public ways, including the drainage swales on Lots 1 and 3. The easement documents must also give the City of Woburn the right (but not the obligation) to enter into the drainage easement areas for emergency repair/maintenance purposes;

APPROVED

4. Prior to endorsement of the subdivision plan, the developer must provide copies of acceptable document(s) which obligate the landowner(s), his/their successors and assignees to the provisions and responsibilities embodied in the document entitled "Operation and Maintenance Plan, Long Term Pollution Prevention Plan (LTPPP) & Illicit Discharge Statement, Definitive Subdivision, 316 New Boston Street, Woburn, Massachusetts; Prepared for DM Five, Inc., c/o The O'Connor Law Firm, 16 South Main Street, Topsfield, MA 01983; prepared by: R.J. O'Connell & Associates, Inc., 80 Montvale Ave., Suite 201, Stoneham, MA 02180; dated November 30, 2020";

5. The City of Woburn is currently planning to relocate the alignment of a portion of the right-of-way known as New Boston Street. As of the date of this decision, the City has not yet effected all of the land takings that will be required to finalize the new alignment for New Boston Street. In recognition of these facts, should the alignment of New Boston Street be effectively altered by the City prior to the construction of the roadway approved by this definitive subdivision plan such as to require modifications to the design of the approved subdivision roadway, the Planning Board reserves its right, pursuant to MGL c. 41, Section 81W, to amend this approval to require changes to the definitive subdivision plan necessary to reflect the new alignment of New Boston Street;

6. The final locations of water services and gates servicing individual lots shall be coordinated with the Department of Public Works and the Fire Department;

7. The developer must employ acceptable and effective methods for dust control during site work, roadway/utility construction and until project completion, including on-site wheel washing measures and daily cleanup of New Boston Street if/when any dirt, dust, or construction debris is generated thereon;

8. If construction of the New Boston Street Bridge and roadway realignment project is completed prior to completion of construction of this subdivision, the developer shall review the final condition of New Boston Street and adjust the subdivision's grading, layout, and drainage system design as may be needed to prevent any increased stormwater flow onto abutting properties. Any such design or construction modifications shall be approved by the City's engineering and public works departments prior to implementation;

9. The developer must submit, prior to commencement of any disturbance of the site in connection with construction of this subdivision, proof that the services of a rodent abatement firm have been secured; and

10. Construction of all aspects of this subdivision shall be completed within two (2) years of the date the definitive subdivision plan was approved (by December 8, 2022).

Bolgen asked if any members had any response to the Planning Director's recommended actions on waivers or proposed conditions of approval. There were none.

Bolgen stated that she would like Attorney Tarby to verify this evening on behalf of his client that no issue is taken with proposed Condition #5, which could require submission of a modified subdivision plan in the event the New Boston Street bridge project begins prior to the commencement of construction on the subdivision roadway. Tarby verified for the record that his client takes no exception to such a condition.

Motion to approve the 316 New Boston Street definitive subdivision project, subject to granting one of the waiver request, denying one other requested waiver, and imposing ten (10) conditions, as just presented by the Planning Director, made by Doherty;
Seconded by Callahan;

<u>Roll call vote on the motion to approve 316 New Boston Street definitive subdivision application, subject to all aforementioned conditions of approval:</u>

Callahan-Aye

APPROVED

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

The motion carried, 6-0-1 (Donovan abstained due to absence at a prior segment of the public hearing).

PUBLIC HEARING: 0 NEW BOSTON STREET DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION (Industriplex Woburn LLC)

Cassidy provided an overview of the definitive subdivision application proposing to subdivide forty-four (44) acres of industrial land into a three (3)-lot subdivision. She added that the subdivision is still the subject of two questions/considerations: 1) the potential condition requiring modification of the plan should the New Boston Street realignment project be completed prior to the commencement of subdivision construction, pursuant to Attorney Tarby's legal memo provided as of this evening, and 2) review of an explanatory memo drafted by the project engineer in response to the Board's request for clarification on the methodology used when conducting a hydrant flow test.

Bolgen asked Attorney Tarby if he would like to add anything additional at this time. Tarby responded that he did not but asked Mr. Tim Williams, project engineer, to provide an overview of his clarification memo for the record.

Tim Williams, project engineer, Allen & Major, 100 Commerce Way, addressed the Board by summarizing his response letter. He stated that the hydrant flow test only included one (1) minute total of concurrent MWRA data and he verified the type of curbing (vertical granite with 6" reveal) to be installed with the roadway, which is now noted on the plan.

Bolgen asked if anyone had any questions or additional information to offer prior to opening the public hearing. Seeing none, she 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 public had indicated in interest in addressing the Board. No members of the audience indicated a desire to speak.

Seeing none, Bolgen called for a motion to close the public hearing.

Motion to close the 0 New Boston Street definitive subdivision public hearing, made by Doherty;
Seconded by Turner;

Roll call vote on the motion to close the close the public hearing on the 0 New Boston Street definitive subdivision application:

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

The motion carried, 6-0-1 (Donovan abstained due to absence at a prior segment of the public hearing).

APPROVED

Bolgen asked Cassidy for her recommendation. Cassidy stated that her recommendation is approve 0 New Boston Street definitive subdivision by granting the following six (6) waivers:

- To allow a right-of-way width of sixty (60) feet instead of eighty (80) feet; allow a pavement width of thirty-four (34) feet instead of forty-four (44) feet; install a pavement thickness of eight inches (8") instead of seven and one half inches (7.5"); and allow planting strip widths of two and one half feet (2.5') instead of two feet (2') (both sides)(pursuant to Chapters I [Section B, Table1, Collector Street] & IV: Section G.6.a.);

- To not require the submission of a sketch plan showing a possible or prospective street layout for any adjacent un-subdivided land owned or controlled by the owner or applicant of the subdivision (pursuant to Chapter II: Section E.1.f);

- Conformance with the Woburn Vision 2020 Master Plan relative to proposed streets (pursuant to Chapter III: Section B.I.b);

- The requirement to install a fire alarm system in the roadway at the expense of the sub-divider, as requested by the Chief of the Fire Department and approved by the Planning Board (Chapter IV: Section G.9);

- To allow construction of a cul-de-sac with a pavement width and grade of eighty-four feet (84') and one and a half percent (1.5%), respectively, instead of the typically required width of eighty-six feet (86') and grade of two percent (2%) (pursuant to Table 2 [Street Design Standards: Turnaround, Pavement Width, and Turnaround Grade]), and

- To not require the looping of the proposed water main with an existing main (pursuant to Chapter II, Section E.3.q. and Chapter III, Section E.4).

Cassidy further stated that she would recommend approval of the 0 New Boston Street definitive subdivision, subject to the following eight (8) conditions:

1. Prior to endorsement of the subdivision plan, the developer must provide to the Board copies of acceptable drainage-related easement documents which obligate the landowner(s), his/their successors and assignees to adequate maintain and repair all elements of the drainage system that are not within public ways, including the proposed drainage easement areas on Lots #1 and #3. The easement documents must also give the City of Woburn the right (but not the obligation) to enter into the drainage easement areas for emergency repair/maintenance purposes;

2. Prior to commencement of site work associated with construction of this subdivision, the developer must provide to the Planning Board office written acknowledgment from Boston Edison, which acknowledgment authorizes construction of the improvements depicted on the definitive subdivision plan;

3. The developer shall submit, prior to endorsement/recordation of the plan with the Registry of Deeds, an Operation & Maintenance (O&M) Plan and Dust Control Plan to the Planning Board for review and approval;

4. The City of Woburn is currently planning to relocate the alignment of a portion of the right-of-way known as New Boston Street. As of the date of this decision, the City has not yet affected all of the land takings that will be required to finalize the new alignment for New Boston Street. In recognition of these facts, should the alignment of New Boston Street be effectively altered by the City prior to the construction of the roadway approved by this definitive subdivision plan such as to require modifications to the design of the approved subdivision roadway, the Planning Board reserves its right, pursuant to MGL c. 41, Section 81W, to amend this approval to require changes to the definitive subdivision plan necessary to reflect the new alignment of New Boston Street.

APPROVED

5. The final location of water services and gates servicing individual lots shall be coordinated with the Department of Public Works and the Fire Department;

6. Prior to commencement of any site work, the placement/final location of the proposed connection sewer manhole shall be determined by the developer via field evaluation post-approval in collaboration with the Department of Public Works;

7. The developer must submit, prior to commencement of any disturbance of the site in connection with construction of this subdivision, proof that the services of a rodent abatement firm have been secured; and

8. That construction of all aspects of this subdivision shall be completed within two (2) years of the date the definitive subdivision plan was approved (by December 8, 2022).

Bolgen asked if Board members had any questions or comments relative to the Planning Director's recommendation. There were none.

Bolgen stated that she would like Attorney Tarby to verify this evening on behalf of his client that no issue is taken with proposed Condition #4, which would require submission of a modified subdivision plan incorporating a revised subdivision roadway layout in the event the New Boston Street bridge project begins prior to the commencement of construction on the subdivision roadway. Tarby verified for the record that his client takes no exception to Condition #4, as proposed.

Bolgen asked if a member was prepared to make a motion. A motion to approve the Planning Director's recommendation to approve the 0 New Boston Street definitive subdivision by granting the six (6) aforementioned waivers and subject to the eight (8) aforementioned conditions was made by Doherty;
Seconded by Turner;

Roll call vote on the motion to approve the 0 New Boston Street definitive subdivision application, by granting the waivers listed above and subject to all eight (8) aforementioned suggested conditions of approval:

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

The motion carried, 6-0-1 (Donovan abstained due to absence at a prior segment of the public hearing).

Donovan assumed the role of Chair for the remainder of the meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING: ROBERTSON WAY DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION: REQUEST TO MODIFY A CONDITION OF THE PLANNING BOARD'S JANUARY 13, 2009 APPROVAL OF THE SUBDIVISION (CONDITION #14) TO ELIMINATE THE REQUIREMENT FOR INSTALLATION OF A SECURITY GATE AT THE LOCATION OF THE "EMERGENCY VEHICLE AND CONSERVATION COMMISSION ACCESS" EASEMENT AT THE END OF THE CUL-DE-SAC (Bryan Melanson)

Cassidy provided a summary of the status of the modification request before the Board and indicated that the request has since been forwarded to the Engineering and Public Works Departments, in addition to the Conservation Commission, to solicit formal comment. Neither Engineering or Public Works staff indicated they took any issue with the proposed modifications requests. However, the Conservation Commission expressed its opinion that a

APPROVED

discovered encroachment onto land under the Commission's jurisdiction should be addressed prior to the Board's approval of any modifications.

Cassidy further stated that Mr. Melanson indicated he would like to have the opportunity to meet onsite with the Conservation Commission to see if members might reconsider their position, given his perspective that current site conditions are favorable and an improvement over what was planned. He has not yet had the opportunity to meet with the Commission in the field. In light of this status and the pending expiration of time for the Board to act on this matter, Cassidy stated that the Board would need to consider granting an extension of time for Board action on the modification, and recommends securing an extension from the current expiration date of December 30, 2020 to January 31, 2021, prior to any continuance of the public hearing scheduled for this evening to the Board's next scheduled meeting on January 26, 2021. Mr. Melanson has already filed a request to extend the time period for Board action to January 26th.

Donovan asked if anyone had any questions prior to opening the public hearing.

Callahan asked if there has been any correspondence or communication from Mr. Melanson with regard to submission of a revised As-built plan. He added that his concern relates to the timely completion of the As-built plan by the time of the January 26th meeting is held, given the amount of work that must go into a revised As-built plan. Cassidy responded that she does not happen to have a formal update on that topic specifically this evening but that she will commit to contacting Mr. Melanson to ensure that he is working on the submission of a revised As-built plan with the intent for Board review/acceptance at its January 26th meeting.

Donovan 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

Donovan asked Cassidy if any audience members were expressing an interest in addressing the Board. No members of the audience indicated a desire to speak.

Seeing none, Donovan called for a motion.

Motion to accept the developer's request for an extension of time, from December 30, 2020 to January 31, 2021, for Board consideration of the modification request for the Robertson Way definitive subdivision plan, made by Doherty;
Seconded by Bolgen;

Roll call vote on the motion to grant an extension of time for Board consideration of the matter of the Robertson Way definitive subdivision modification, from December 30, 2020 to January 31, 2021, made by Doherty:

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

The motion carried, 7-0-0.

Motion to continue the public hearing on the matter of the Robertson Way definitive subdivision plan modification, to January 26, 2021, at 7:00 pm, made by Doherty;
Seconded by Bolgen;

APPROVED

Roll call vote on the motion to continue the public hearing on the matter of the Robertson Way definitive subdivision plan modification request, to January 26, 2021, at 7:00 pm

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

The motion carried, 7-0-0.

FERULLO DRIVE (MURRAY SHANNON FARM) SUBDIVISION: ACCEPTANCE OF TRI-PARTITE AGREEMENT AS SURETY TO REPLACE EXISTING COVENANT, RELEASE OF LOTS FROM LANGUAGE OF RESTRICTIVE COVENANT PROHIBITING BUILDING ON OR SALE OF LOTS (Robert Murray)

Cassidy provided an overview of the request from developer Robert Murray to post an alternate form of surety to guarantee subdivision completion. The current form of surety is a covenant and the developer wishes to replace it with a Tripartite Agreement (TPA) from the United Bank in the amount of $525,252.15. The figure of $525,252.15 was based upon recommendation from the Engineering Department; in fact, the the Board voted at its November meeting to formally set the required surety at the above-mentioned amount.

Cassidy further stated that upon receipt of a fully executed TPA as surety to guarantee subdivision completion, she would recommend the Board vote to authorize execution of the Form G, allowing for the release of all subdivision lots from the restrictive Covenant prohibiting building or sale.

Doherty stated that he noted an inconsistency in the staff report relative to the stated amount of surety. Cassidy responded to clarify that the amount provided in the actual TPA document is correct.

Motion to accept the TPA, in the form submitted, as surety to guarantee completion of the Ferullo Drive subdivision, made by Doherty;
Seconded by Ventresca;

Roll call vote on the motion accept the TPA as surety to guarantee completion of the Ferullo Drive subdivision, subject receipt of a fully executed document:

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

The motion carried, 7-0-0.

Motion to release the lots in the Ferullo Drive subdivision from the language of the restrictive Covenant upon receipt of a fully-executed copy of the TPA in the form approved above, made by Ventresca;
Seconded by Doherty;

Roll call vote on the motion to release lots in the Ferullo Drive subdivision from the language of the restrictive covenant, upon receipt of a fully-executed copy of the TPA in the form approved above:

APPROVED

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

The motion carried, 7-0-0.

LEGACY LANE DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION: REQUEST TO ACCEPT SUBMITTED AS-BUILT & STREET ACCEPTANCE PLANS AND RELEASE REMAINING SURETY BEING HELD TO GUARANTEE SUBDIVISION COMPLETION (Frank Michienzi)

Cassidy provided a summary of the bond release request now before the Board and further explained that a release of the surety this evening would be inappropriate due to several outstanding subdivision conditions of approval and remaining outstanding work, including the submission of a tree belt easement plan and easements and the erection of identification signage at the location of the emergency turnaround.

Cassidy further stated that the Board must also consider whether to grant an extension of time for action on this request since by Statute the Board only has until December 10th to grant or deny the request. Mr. Michienzi has submitted a request for an extension of the time frame, from December 10, 2020 to January 28, 2021. She would therefore recommend the Board grant the applicant's request for an extension of time for Board action, from the current expiration date of December 10, 2020 to January 28, 2021.

Motion to grant an extension of time on the matter of a final bond release for Legacy Lane, from December 10, 2020 to January 28, 2021, made by Doherty;
Seconded by Bolgen;

Roll call vote on the motion to grant an extension of time for Planning Board action relative to a final release of surety for the Legacy Lane subdivision:

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

The motion carried, 7-0-0.

PLANNING DIRECTOR UPDATE

Cassidy provided a brief update on the topic of expiration of construction completion dates. She added that status updates had been requested and provided by the developers of the 24 Flagg Street and 88-92 Pearl Street (Alan R. Gerrish Drive) subdivisions, and copies of those updates were provided to members in advance of this evening.

Cassidy said the Board's January meeting agenda will likely include the Robertson Way modification public hearing, discussions on progress toward completing the Robertson Way and Carlson Way subdivisions, and potential discussion of satisfying Legacy Lane conditions of approval and bond release.

APPROVED

Cassidy also stated that an application for an Approval Not Required (ANR) plan, located at 44 Fowle Street, was reviewed by staff and endorsed by the Board Chair since the November meeting. Staff would be pleased to provide a copy upon request.

Bolgen reminded staff that an election for Planning Board Chair and Vice Chair should be included on the January 26th meeting agenda, given that it will be the first meeting of the year. Cassidy stated that she would do so.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: October 27, 2020 and November 17, 2020 virtual meetings.

Motion to accept the draft October 27, 2020 meeting minutes, as submitted, made by Bolgen;
Seconded by Doherty;

Roll call vote on the motion to accept the draft October 27, 2020 meeting minutes, as submitted:
Callahan-Aye
Doherty-Aye
Edmonds-Aye
Turner-Aye
Ventresca-Aye
Donovan-Aye
Bolgen-Aye

Motion carried, 7-0-0.

Motion to accept the draft November 17, 2020 meeting minutes, as submitted, made by Bolgen;
Seconded by Turner;

Roll call vote on the motion to accept the draft November 17, 2020 meeting minutes, as submitted:
Callahan-Aye
Doherty-Aye
Edmonds-Aye
Turner-Aye
Ventresca-Aye
Donovan-Aye
Bolgen-Aye

Motion carried, 7-0-0.

ADJOURNMENT

Donovan asked if there was any other business for the Board to conduct and there was none. Seeing no further business, Bolgen made a motion to adjourn the December 8, 2020 Planning Board meeting, at 9:36 pm;
Seconded by Turner;

Roll call vote on the motion to adjourn the December 8, 2020 Planning Board meeting, at 7:53 pm:
Callahan-Aye
Doherty-Aye
Edmonds-Aye
Turner-Aye
Ventresca-Aye
Donovan-Aye
Bolgen-Aye

APPROVED

Motion carried, 7-0-0.

The meeting adjourned at 7:53 p.m.

Table of Documents Used and/or Referenced at Meeting

316 New Boston Street Definitive Subdivision: (1) Copy of revised plan (last dated November 30, 2020); and (2) Email correspondence from DPW (dated December 3, 2020)
0 New Boston Street Definitive Subdivision: Memorandum from Attorney Joseph Tarby (dated December 3, 2020)
Robertson Way Definitive Subdivision: Copy of an extension request from developer Robert Melanson (December 3, 2020)
Ferullo Drive Definitive Subdivision: (1) Draft TPA Agreement language proposed for acceptance; and (2) Draft Form G (Release of Restrictive Covenant)
Legacy Lane Definitive Subdivision: (1) Copy of the initial bond release/plan review request; (2) Engineering Department comment letter; and (3) Developer's request for an extension of time for Board action (dated December 2, 2020)
24 Flagg Street & Alan R. Gerrish Drive (88-92 Pearl Street): Update on subdivision completion progress to Planning Board (dated November 24th and November 17th, respectively)
Planning Director Update: (1) Copies of Chair-endorsed ANR plans affecting properties at 581 Lowell Street (Winchester & Woburn) and 93 Middle Street; and (2) Copies of staff memo to City Solicitor and response memo relative to signatory requirements for Board notarization
Draft Meeting Minutes: October 27, 2020 and November 17, 2020 meetings

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Orr

Dan Orr
City Planner/Grant Writer

APPROVED