



TOWN OF BURLINGTON, MA
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
APRIL 7, 2022

Members Present: Chairman Brenda Rappaport; Vice Chairman William Gaffney; Clerk Paul Raymond; Michael Espejo; Joseph A. Impemba; Ernest Covino (attending remotely) and Barbara G. L'Heureux

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Planning Director Kristin Kassner; Senior Planner Elizabeth Bonventre; and Assistant Planner Brady Caldwell

1. Call the Meeting of the Planning Board to Order

Chairman Rappaport called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM. The Town of Burlington will be holding the April 7, 2022 meeting of the Planning Board as a hybrid meeting due to the current State of Emergency due to the Covid-19 virus. As such, the Governor issued an executive order on March 12, 2020 authorizing remote meetings under G.L c. 30A Section 20.

Ms. Bonventre stated that the option for remote participation via WebEx is being provided as a courtesy to the public. The public can join the meeting via the WebEx link posted on the Town's website, or they can call in by dialing 617-315-0704. The meeting is being broadcast live on BCAT, and on cable networks and residents can email questions to Planning@burlington.org or on Facebook live.

MOTION – Member L'Heureux made a motion to take item "7.a" out of order for discussion purposes. The motion was seconded by Member Espejo and voted 7-0-0.

7.a Continued Public Hearing – Petition to amend the Zoning Bylaw, Article II: Definitions and Article V "Dimensional Requirements" to address Groundwater Separation for One -Dwelling District – Submitted by the Planning Board

MOTION – Member L'Heureux made a motion to continue this matter to the Planning Board Meeting of April 21, 2022 at the request of Planning Staff. The motion was seconded by Member Espejo and voted 7-0-0.

MOTION – Member L'Heureux made a motion to take item "7.m" out of order for discussion purposes. The motion was seconded by Member Espejo and voted 7-0-0.

7.m Discussion – Sign District Map – Zoning Bylaw Review Committee

MOTION – Member L'Heureux made a motion to continue this matter to the Planning Board Meeting of June 2, 2022. The motion was seconded by Member Espejo and voted 7-0-0.

2. Citizens Time



TOWN OF BURLINGTON
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
APRIL 7, 2022

Betsy Hughes, Town Meeting Member (Precinct 7) – Ms. Hughes asked if the Planning Department had the final approval plans for the storage facility on Blanchard Rd. Ms. Bonventre replied that she will double check the status of that application.

3. Announcements

Ms. Bonventre read the announcements. The deadline for the Town Meeting Warrant to be printed is Friday April 8 at 1:00 PM at the Selectboard’s Office. The annual Town Election is happening Saturday April 9 from 8:00 AM – 8:00 PM at the high school. The Ways & Means Committee will be April 13 at 7:00 PM in the Main Hearing Room via Cisco Webex. The Sculpture Park Committee is on April 19 at 4:00 PM via Webex. There’s going to be a Town-wide Forum for Burlington Housing Needs Assessment on Wednesday April 27 at 7:30 PM via Zoom. Chairman Rappaport mentioned that the Town-wide Yard Sale will be on April 30.

Chairman Rappaport wanted to acknowledge two people that are moving on to other roles. After serving with us for three years, since 2019, Member Espejo will be heading over to the Selectboard pending Saturday’s election. Our Assistant Planner, Brady Caldwell, who began with us in February 2020 and helped steer the ship through the pandemic is moving on to another opportunity out of state.

Member L’Heureux stated that mentioned that the Sculpture Park Committee is working on an event in May to dedicate global warming. There will be more details in the next few weeks.

4. Legal Notices of Interest

There were no legal notices.

5. Non-Approvals

There were no non-approvals.

6. Administrative Matters

There were no administrative matters.

7. Matters of Appointment

MOTION – Member L’Heureux made a motion to take items “7.b” and “7.c” together for discussion purposes. The motion was seconded by Member Espejo and voted 7-0-0.

7.b Continued Public Hearing – Petition to amend the Zoning Bylaw, Article III “Districts”, Article IV “Use Regulations”, and Article VIII “Overlay Districts (8.5.0 Town Center)” to create a new zoning District “Town Center Multifamily (TCM)” – Submitted by Novaya Real Estate Ventures LLC

7.c Continued Public Hearing – petition to amend the zoning bylaw and zoning map to create a new zoning district to be called the Town Center Multifamily (TCM) District, to rezone properties at



TOWN OF BURLINGTON
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
APRIL 7, 2022

135, 137, 137R, 139A, and 139 Cambridge Street into the Town Center Multifamily (TCM) District – Submitted by Novaya Real Estate Ventures LLC

Peter Carbone of Novaya Real Estate Ventures LLC, Jeff Feldman, and Attorney Mark Vaughn from Riemer & Braunstein appeared before the Board.

Mr. Carbone summarized that they've been working with the Planning staff the past week on some of the language changes to the bylaw and have been going back and forth on a first and second draft of the development agreement which in essence ties a lot of this together if the rezoning were to go through. I think the understanding is that we will finalize that sometime between now and when the next Town Meeting happens.

Ms. Kassner stated that we're comfortable with the draft as proposed. What will happen is the Planning Board will vote with the recommendation that the items be drafted in a development agreement. The Select Board will have to vote that development agreement in place before the Town Meeting. What you will be voting on is the zoning bylaw amendment and the rezoning of those parcels. The development agreement will accompany that rezoning into the district.

Mr. Carbone summarized the following provisions:

- Any condominium documents shall prohibit Short Term Rentals (as defined in Town Bylaws)
- No more than 82 residential units
- The unit mix is just adhering to state requirements (compliance with MGL Chapter 40A, §3A)
- Number of affordable units shall be at least 13 in accordance with Town Bylaws
- No retail use as part of any multi-family use
- A maximum of 2,000 square ft. of professional office / commercial use permitted as part of any multi-family use
- Closing off the North Entrance (as shown on the concept plan) except for fire egress
- Fencing to be installed along the rear and sides of Premises
- Implementation of LEED standards in the building
 - Our commitment is going to continue to evolve on the sustainability side
 - Units themselves are pretty much all electric except a lot of times they'll have gas for boilers
 - Electric car charging spaces on site
 - A green area on top of the parking lot roof

Ms. Kassner wanted to highlight Item C which was specifically put in by Planning staff to ensure that we meet the MBTA communities and that it is consistent with the statute (15 units per acre family friendly and by right). Item I stemmed from comments from the Land Use Committee in terms of really wanting to reduce dependence on fossil fuels.

Member Espejo asked how do we make sure that the decision is written and so we don't open a pandora's



TOWN OF BURLINGTON
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
APRIL 7, 2022

box of this happening all over the Town Center overlay. Ms. Kassner replied that the bylaw is creating an opportunity to have an overlay district in the Town Center for multi-family housing within the central business district overlay. You're creating that language in the bylaw but what you're not doing is you're not allowing it in all of the Town Center except for with a vote into that district by Town Meeting which would require an appearance before this Board first. What you're seeing with this applicant is you're looking at the zoning amendment but then the rezoning piece that comes with the development agreement. Essentially, you're creating an option, but just like this applicant, anyone else in the Town Center could approach us to amend the zoning bylaw and allow this. There's quite a bit of protection and oversight within the Town Center and we will be having conversations with this body and other land-use boards over the next few months.

Member L'Heureux stated that Member Espejo's concern is valid because there will be other property owners that will come forward to be part of this new zone. As for this specific property, Member L'Heureux asked to renew a request made at the previous Board Meeting that you consider a higher number of affordable units. Mr. Carbone replied that we're hitting a roadblock on the number of units because we're only getting a certain amount of revenue out of a certain number of units. Member L'Heureux then wanted to clarify that there's going to be 13 units that are affordable and that there would be another small number of units that you will be selling to another party at a reduced rate because of a separate agreement that you have. Mr. Carbone replied yes. Mr. Carbone then added that if it were redeveloped for retail there'd be a lot more traffic.

Member Impemba asked how the 82 residential units would affect the percentage of residential in the downtown area. Ms. Kassner replied that back in 2005 we had multi-family by right but understood that the downtown area needed a vibrancy with commercial development. With an added mixed use of multi-family, we put a cap at that time (25 square ft.) within the Town Center could be residential. That provision was removed in 2010. With this project overall, you're still looking at a large square footage of commercials, so you're still going to be at roughly that quarter of the square footage. Member Impemba then asked if Town Meeting wanted additional assurances will there be a possibility of figuring out the exact impact and what the square footage becomes, and then incorporate that somehow into a vote at Town Meeting. Ms. Kassner replied that this vote at Town Meeting is to add this language to the bylaw and to vote on only these parcels. If any other parcels were to come into this district they'd need to go through that process.

Vice Chairman Gaffney asked if we're going to put a development agreement for each application we get from now on. Ms. Kassner replied that we have a handful of development agreements for rezonings that we've done in the past where something comes in that can't necessarily be controlled by zoning, such as ownership versus rental, which is not a mechanism of zoning. Development agreements come up when there are things discussed and agreed upon when we don't have a zoning amendment at the same time. Mr. Carbone added that how we're proposing to do it doesn't foreclose another project getting done or not getting done in the future.

Clerk Raymond commented that he is not in favor of this project and would rather see what Town Meeting



TOWN OF BURLINGTON
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
APRIL 7, 2022

has to say about it.

Member Covino stated that the land is eventually going to be used for something and this appears to be the least intrusive. Anybody who wants to add multi-family housing to the Town Center has to propose the zoning change at the Town Meeting. Once the Town Meeting agrees to it, then they will come back before this Board for a Permit and Site Plan Approval.

Shari Ellis, Town Meeting Member (Precinct 3) – Ms. Ellis stated that she is against this project citing traffic concerns and the height of the building. Ms. Ellis added that we have no real public transit at the moment in this community other than the one bus line and I wanted to see if we can add something in the future to make public transit available in our town. Ms. Ellis then asked if the affordable units would have a lower HOA fee. Mr. Carbone replied that something has to give in terms of spending a certain amount of your income on total housing including the HOA fee. I don't recall whether they lowered the HOA fee or if they lowered the purchase price, but it's all taken into account. Ms. Kassner also responded to Ms. Ellis comments by stating that Item No. 1 captures public transit. If there was a contribution, then it's certainly something the Board can consider in making the waivers, but I would hesitate to put anything that says "you shall make a contribution" in the bylaw itself.

Andrea Tracey – Ms. Tracey stated that there are new developers that want opportunities to build residential and asked the Board why they are limiting it to just one developer. Chairman Rappaport replied I don't think that anyone's limiting it to just one developer. If someone wants to propose a project, they are more than welcome to present it before this Board.

Melissa Foster – Ms. Foster stated that she and her husband are direct abutters, and this greatly impacts our family. We've had our concerns, but we do realize that this is a valuable parcel, and something will go there. We do believe that it will add value to the area.

Mr. Vaughn asked if it would be possible to potentially get an informal poll from the Board to give us a sense whether the majority of the Board feels like the proposal makes sense in terms of moving forward.

Sally Willard, Town Meeting Member (Precinct 4) – Ms. Willard responded to Mr. Vaughn's comment. As someone who has submitted many articles for Town Meetings, I think that it's certainly appropriate for the proponents to submit their backup and to submit the article for publication even without the vote from the Planning Board which gives you time to come back to vote at your next Board Meeting. Although the seller may have set a deadline, a 10 – 12 day delay should certainly not impact their deal with a single payment and so I think that postponing your decision to close the hearing until after the members have had a chance to read the agreement is fine.

MOTION – Member L'Heureux made a motion to continue this matter to the Planning Board meeting of April 21, 2022. The motion was seconded by Clerk Raymond and voted 7-0-0.

MOTION – Member L'Heureux made a motion to continue Item "c" to the Planning Board meeting of April



TOWN OF BURLINGTON
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
APRIL 7, 2022

21, 2022. The motion was seconded by Clerk Raymond and voted 7-0-0.

7.d Continued Public Hearing – Petition to amend the Network Drive at Northwest Park Planned Development District Zoning, Special Conditions, and Use Provisions - Submitted by Nordblom Development Company and its affiliates NDB Property Owner 1, LP and NDB Property Owner 2, LP

Todd Fremont-Smith of Nordblom Development Company and Attorney Robert Buckley from Riemer & Braunstein appeared before the Board.

Mr. Buckley stated that since our last meeting the only change that we've made to the proposal was that we added in the development conditions a commitment to develop an infrastructure analysis of the area as well as an assessment of public benefits. We have an obligation, if this is approved by Town Meeting, to prepare a master plan studying the infrastructure and public benefits that could be effectuated over time in this area of town. The only substantive change was to add the public benefits analysis.

Ms. Kassner stated that in a plan development district there are zoning provisions, use provisions, and special conditions (which act similar to a development agreement). We've put in here mandating the planning effort and expanding the infrastructure, public benefit, community benefit, and enhancements associated with additional floor area. The applicant will fund this project.

Mr. Buckley commented that he was at the Massachusetts State House this week on a major project and one of the first questions they ask is whether you have a master plan or if you have a plan to effectuate these improvements because they don't want to commit to funding something that is pie in the sky.

Vice Chairman Gaffney asked how will this project benefit Burlington, and there was a request by the Zoning Review Committee to give some renderings of what the signage might look like from the street. Mr. Fremont-Smith replied (regarding signage) that we're putting that together and we'll have diagrams for the ZBRC Meeting and the Town Meeting. What we're asking for is two feet in each dimension. The buildings on Network Dr. are very large and we think that the buildings could easily carry that kind of signage internal to the campus. They're not visible from Middlesex Turnpike. We believe that this will benefit Burlington's overall economic structure and there is an ability, we think, to grow the tax base. Burlington is very much on an upward spiral as we're seeing a lot of great companies coming here.

Member Covino asked how this compares with the sign regulations for Northwest Park. Mr. Buckley replied that it's a different scenario because there you have retail and restaurants right up on the street, and here the buildings are substantially back from Middlesex Turnpike.

Member L'Heureux asked if the Planning staff could put in language to make sure that we don't end up with signage that is incredibly bright that can be seen from miles away.

Mr. Buckley stated that just for clarification we're going to delete the proposed amendment to signage.

MOTION – Member L'Heureux made a motion to close the public hearing on this matter. The motion was



TOWN OF BURLINGTON
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
APRIL 7, 2022

seconded by Member Espejo and voted 7-0-0.

MOTION – Member L’Heureux made a motion to recommend **favorably** on the petition to amend the Network Drive at Northwest Park Planned Development (PD) District (formerly Sun Microsystems) Zoning Provisions, Special Conditions, and Use Provisions submitted by Nordblom Development Company and its affiliates NDB Property Owner 1, LP and NDB Property Owner 2, LP as amended. The motion was seconded by Member Espejo and voted 7-0-0.

7.e Continued Public Hearing – Continued Public Hearing – Petitions to rezone property to the Innovation (I) District – 56 Middlesex Turnpike and 15 Adams Street - Submitted by Burlex Realty LLC & 15 Adams Street, LLC

Attorney Thomas Murphy, George Katsarakas of 56 Middlesex Turnpike and his wife appeared before the Board.

Mr. Murphy stated that one of the three properties that joined in this petition (54 Middlesex Turnpike) withdrew, and so there are only two properties left: 56 Middlesex Turnpike and 15 Adams Street. We did appear before the Land Use Committee a couple of weeks ago and have not heard back from them. My clients feel strongly that this change would make their property more valuable moving forward given the location in conjunction with the other district zoned property in the area.

Ms. Kassner stated that on 15 Adams St. we recently had on the Site Plan to continue working with the applicant on potential easement or access for pedestrians / bicyclists. This property is well situated above the wetland, which is a major hurdle.

Member L’Heureux stated that The Real School of Music (56 Middlesex Turnpike) is a wonderful addition to Burlington and asked the Planning staff to possibly reach out when the appropriate time comes to help them find a new home. Ms. Kassner replied that a database was started of open properties and options, so we can certainly link the two at such a time when they may decide to move. They are permitted within the zoning district since they’re a non-profit.

MOTION – Member L’Heureux made a motion to close the public hearing on the matter at 56 Middlesex Turnpike. The motion was seconded by Member Espejo and voted 7-0-0.

MOTION – Member L’Heureux made a motion to recommend **favorably** on the petition to rezone property at 56 Middlesex Turnpike into the Innovation (I) District, to amend the Zoning Map to reflect these changes submitted by Burlex Realty LLC. The motion was seconded by Member Espejo and voted 7-0-0.

MOTION – Member L’Heureux made a motion to close the public hearing on the matter at 15 Adams Street. The motion was seconded by Member Espejo and voted 7-0-0.

MOTION – Member L’Heureux made a motion to recommend **favorably** on the petition to rezone property at 15 Adams Street into the Innovation (I) District, to amend the Zoning Map to reflect these changes



TOWN OF BURLINGTON
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
APRIL 7, 2022

submitted 15 Adams Street LLC subject to the Applicants entering into a dialog about potential connections (vehicular and/or bicycle/pedestrian) from this property to the adjacent former Route 3 Right of Way land under the ownership of the Burlington Housing Authority for the purposes of access. The motion was seconded by Member Espejo and voted 7-0-0.

7.f Public Hearing – Application for Approval of a Special Permit pursuant to Section 4.2.6.2 “Convenience food stores, drugstores, retail stores for sale of beauty and health aids, smoking supplies, periodicals; none with the sale of food intended for consumption on the premises” of the Zoning Bylaws – 226 Cambridge Street – Burlington Smoke Shop Inc., Applicant

Attorney Thomas Murphy and Sam Patel, owner of Burlington Smoke Shop Inc., appeared for the application.

Mr. Murphy stated that his client provided a proposed floor plan at the request made to him by the Board. There were also some issues and concerns raised by Board Members at the previous Meeting about the exterior appearance of the building. My client has agreed to keep the front glass door and colonial details. There will be a sign fitting into the space where the bank’s sign was before. There were also suggestions that the windows be tinted, and my client is certainly amenable to that.

Chairman Rappaport, Vice Chairman Gaffney, and Member Impemba stated that by creating a foyer it gives you the ability to check IDs and ensure compliance with state law to card all patrons. The addition of awnings and tint to the four windows might also be beneficial because it would deter folks from looking inside. We would also like there to be exterior illumination on the sign to streamline what we’re doing in the Town Center.

Mr. Patel stated that no one can go inside when they're trying to open the door because we have a buzzer on our neck. When the button is pressed, we allow patrons to enter. This was installed at our Beverly location a few weeks ago. When a customer enters the building, we have to ask for their identification, which is required by state law. A permanent sign will be put on either the window or glass door reading “21 years of age or older.” We’re not planning to put anything on any of these windows, rather keep it simplistic. I will be adding some awnings on each of the windows to match the building in Beverly. Additionally, there will be a cigar room which is locked. We can open it when customers come in, but the door locks automatically after they go in and out.

Member Espejo asked how long the building had been vacant. Mr. Patel replied two and a half years.

Member L’Heureux stated that since this is a Special Permit, we have to consider community benefit. I don’t see a community benefit, as we already have two other smoke shops in Burlington already. Since this building is next to an ice cream shop, I don’ think it’s an appropriate location for this business and I will not be voting in favor. Furthermore, it seems as though we’re working really hard to hide what this business is for. Member Covino agreed and stated that there are some people in Burlington that might be in favor of it, but it looks like it would fit better someplace else.



TOWN OF BURLINGTON
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
APRIL 7, 2022

Mr. Murphy replied to the comments made by Members L'Heureux and Covino. There are a lot of businesses in Town I don't necessarily partake in, but there's a segment of the community that would go there. Some people might be offended by various uses (liquor stores as another example), but they do meet a need to a certain segment of the community, and I think that it is important as a community to have a diversity in the services that you offer because not everybody thinks the same way.

With Board Members expressing concern, Mr. Murphy stated that we'll either withdraw without prejudice or modify the business model if applicable. When can come back at the next Meeting and continue discussions, including a list of products that can or can't be sold. Chairman Rappaport replied that would be helpful.

MOTION – Member Espejo made a motion to continue this matter to the Planning Board Meeting of April 21, 2022. The motion was seconded by Member L'Heureux and voted 7-0-0.

MOTION – Member L'Heureux made a motion to take items “7.g” through “7.l” together for discussion purposes. The motion was seconded by Member Espejo and voted 7-0-0.

7.g Continued Discussion - Application for Approval of a Minor Engineering Change – 43 South Avenue – The Gutierrez Company, Applicant

7.h Continued Public Hearing – Application for Approval of a Special Permit pursuant to Section 1.4.1 “Light manufacturing or processing plants” of the South Avenue Planned Development (PD) Zoning District provisions – 43 South Avenue – The Gutierrez Company, Applicant

7.i Continued Public Hearing – Application for Approval of a Special Permit pursuant to Section 1.4.4 “Hazardous and toxic materials/chemical use storage, transport, disposal or discharge. Disposal must be off-site and under appropriate manifest and discharge must only be to sanitary sewer if allowed by Massachusetts Water Resources Authority and the Burlington Department of Public Works” of the South Avenue Planned Development (PD) Zoning District provisions – 43 South Avenue – The Gutierrez Company, Applicant

7.j Continued Public Hearing – Application for Approval of a Special Permit pursuant to Section 1.4.5 “Generation or storage of hazardous waste limited to the volumes classified as very small quantity generator with approval of Board of Health” of the South Avenue Planned Development (PD) Zoning District provisions – 43 South Avenue – The Gutierrez Company, Applicant

7.k Continued Public Hearing – Application for Approval of a Special Permit pursuant to Section 1.4.6 “Generation or storage of hazardous waste limited to the volumes classified as small quantity generator with approval of Board of Health” of the South Avenue Planned Development (PD) Zoning District provisions – 43 South Avenue – The Gutierrez Company, Applicant

7.l Continued Public Hearing – Application for Approval of a Special Permit pursuant to Section 1.6.16 “Above ground storage of oils and fuels/petroleum products including storage for on-site heating purposes and landscaping maintenance equipment (in excess of 50 gallons). Underground



TOWN OF BURLINGTON
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
APRIL 7, 2022

storage is prohibited” of the South Avenue Planned Development (PD) Zoning District provisions – 43 South Avenue – The Gutierrez Company, Applicant

Attorney Robert Buckley from Riemer & Braunstein and Scott Weiss of The Gutierrez Company appeared for the application.

Mr. Buckley stated that this is the last component of 43 South Avenue which was zoned and marketed for life-science. The 2016 Special Permit was recently extended by the Planning Board on February 4, 2022 to July 18, 2024.

Mr. Weiss stated that this building was the third of the three buildings planned as part of the Keurig campus. Keurig did have an option for the third building but instead terminated that option and weren't proceeding with that. In 2016, a Special Permit was approved for development on the Site. The building is fully permitted and is allowed for laboratory use. The long list of uses includes fuel storage and hazardous material storage. This is really a continuation of our success collectively in attracting life-science users to the Town. We have done renovation at 4 Burlington Woods Drive and 10 Corporate Drive. The Minor Engineering change is a shift in the building footprint. It was a six-story building on top of some parking and now the building is five-stories tall. The building height will remain unchanged at 90 feet. The parking level that slides underneath this building on the side facing Route 3 is being realigned within the site from the driveway. The reason that's important is because we're making more room at the bottom of the building (in the loading area) for any material storage. As a result of this realignment, more than a hundred parking spaces will be reduced.

Ms. Kassner stated that we have no concerns with any of the modifications / accommodations.

Member Impemba stated that you're probably going to generate less traffic. Mr. Scott replied that all of the traffic mitigation for this project has been implemented because it was a three-building project.

Member L'Heureux asked if it was possible to have the lights go off if there was nobody moving in front of them. There's no reason for the lights to be on if there's nobody inside the building working. Mr. Scott replied that a daylight harvesting component and motion-activated lighting will be part of this building.

Vice Chairman Gaffney asked if we are gaining impervious surfaces since over a hundred parking spaces are being taken away. Mr. Scott replied that this site is a brownfield redevelopment, so it was an environmentally impaired property before we bought it, and a lot of cleanup has been done on this site. There's a limitation to how much greenspace we can put in because the environmental engineers stated that you cannot uncover more of the site. We maximized what we can do greenspace wise today (64.8 percent impervious). We're never going to change our previous impervious ratios on this site.

MOTION – Member Espejo made a motion to close the public hearing on this matter. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Gaffney and voted 7-0-0.

MOTION – Member Espejo made a motion to approve the request of a Special Permit pursuant to 1.4.1



TOWN OF BURLINGTON
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
APRIL 7, 2022

“Light manufacturing or processing plants”, 1.4.4 “Hazardous and toxic materials/chemical use storage, transport, disposal or discharge...”, 1.4.5 “Generation or storage of hazardous waste limited to the volumes classified as very small quantity generator...”, 1.4.6 “Generation or storage of hazardous waste limited to the volumes classified as small quantity generator...” and 1.6.16 “Above ground storage of oils and fuels/petroleum products...” of the South Avenue Planned Development (PD) Zoning District provisions, to permit the operation of a biomedical life science facility, for property located in the South Avenue Planned Development (PD) Zoning District located at 43 South Avenue, subject to the terms and conditions contained in exhibit “B” as amended. The motion was seconded by Member L’Heureux and voted 7-0-0.

MOTION – Member L’Heureux made a motion to approve the request for approval of a Minor Engineering Change for property located 43 South Avenue (“Premises”) to allow for the shift in the five-story laboratory building footprint, realign the parking lot entrance to be closer to its current location, adjust the parking layout which will result in the reduction of the total number of parking spaces provided from 1,102 spaces to 976 spaces, and install utility pads for electrical service and back-up generator power as reflected on the redlined site plan entitled “43 South Avenue Burlington, MA,” prepared by SMMA, dated February 23, 2022 consisting of one (1) sheet subject to the following revisions, terms, and conditions as amended. The motion was seconded by Member Espejo and voted 7-0-0.

9. Minutes

Planning Board minutes of February 17, 2022 and March 3, 2022 postponed.

10. Other Matters

10.a Discussion

10.a.i MBTA Communities

Ms. Kassner stated that we submitted our letter on March 31, 2022 outlining all the comments that the Town had.

10.a.ii Master Plan Update

Chairman Rappaport stated that we are making progress with regards to the Master Plan.

10.b Correspondence

There was no correspondence.

10.c Reports from Town Counsel

There were no reports from Town Counsel.

10.d Subcommittee Reports



TOWN OF BURLINGTON
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
APRIL 7, 2022

There were no subcommittee reports.

10.e Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

10.f New Business

There was no new business.

MOTION – Member Espejo made a motion to adjourn the April 7, 2022 Planning Board meeting at 10:26 PM. The motion was seconded by Member L’Heureux and voted 7-0-0.

*Respectfully Submitted by Eric Bergeron,
Recording Clerk*