

**MELROSE PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
Special Meeting and Public Hearing
Monday, December 16, 2013
7:45 PM**

Mayor's Conference Room, 2nd Floor, City Hall, 562 Main Street

PRESENT: Carla Morelli, Anne DeSouza-Ward, Michael Cassavoy, Ed Cassidy, Paul King, Robert Mercado, Sharon Petrillo, John Sadowski, and Jack Welch

ABSENT: None

Denise Gaffey, Director and City Planner, Adam Duchesneau, Assistant Planning Director, and Robert Van Campen, Esq., City Solicitor were present.

The meeting was called to order at 7:51 PM by Ms. Morelli.

MINUTES

Special Meeting, November 18, 2013

Mr. Mercado MADE a MOTION to accept the minutes of November 18, 2013. Ms. DeSouza-Ward SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed and Ms. Petrillo and Mr. Welch were absent from the vote.

At this time Ms. Petrillo and Mr. Welch arrived at the meeting.

BOARD OF APPEALS

Case # 13-027, 27 Briggs Street, Joan Kershaw

Applicant Joan Kershaw was present to discuss her application with the Planning Board along with her contractor Jim Cloughtry. Ms. Kershaw indicated that access into the house is very narrow and there is also very little space between the internal stairs and where the door swings inward. She stated that they would like to enclose a portion of the front stoop to create a small mudroom. Ms. Morelli confirmed that the proposed project is primarily to relieve space issues that are inside the house as opposed to creating new occupiable space and Ms. Kershaw indicated that was correct. Mr. Cassavoy confirmed that the goal was to create a small vestibule and asked if the door would swing outward. Mr. Cloughtry indicated the main door would still swing inward, as would the outer door, and there would also be a storm door that would swing outward. Ms. DeSouza-Ward confirmed that the current front setback was 11 feet and the proposed front setback would be reduced to 9 feet as a result of the project. Mr. Cloughtry indicated this was correct.

Mr. Sadowski then inquired about the proposed two-story addition that was shown on the left side of the existing structure on the Plot Plan. Ms. Kershaw indicated that they had decided not to pursue that addition. Mr. Mercado asked about the hand-drawn markings that were displayed on the Plot Plan in the rear right corner of the property. Ms. Kershaw stated that a fence was added at the property after the Plot Plan was created. Mr. Mercado asked if the Applicant had spoken to her neighbors and Ms. Kershaw indicated that she had and no one had raised an issue about the project. Mr. Welch noted that other structures in the neighborhood appeared to be similar in design. Ms. Kershaw added that their property was generally similar but the fact that it is a corner lot makes it a bit tough. She continued on to note that most other dwellings in the area have some type of small porch attached to them. Mr. Cassidy indicated that he felt the project was a minor, de minimis change to a currently nonconforming structure and that a standard letter should be sent to the Board of Appeals. Mr. Sadowski felt the letter should clarify that the

two-story addition on the left side of the existing structure has not been built and that this project is a small change to the structure which does not appear to be objectionable to the neighborhood. Ms. DeSouza-Ward agreed with this sentiment and Mr. Welch stated that the project would be an improvement to the property. Mr. Sadowski added that he thought the letter should indicate that the Planning Board takes no objection to the proposed project.

Mr. Cassidy then MADE a MOTION to send a standard letter to the Board of Appeals which clarifies that the proposed two-story addition on the west side of the existing dwelling identified on the Plot Plan has not been constructed and that the Planning Board does not take objection to this small proposed change nor does it appear to have a negative impact on the surrounding neighborhood. Mr. Mercado SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Documents: - ZBA Application Case # 13-027
 - Doorway photographs submitted by the Applicant

Case # 13-028, 22 Burrell Street, Virginia Shanahan

Applicant and owner Virginia Shanahan was present to discuss her application with the Planning Board. She indicated that they were doing work to renovate the property which far exceeded her original expectations of what needed to be done. Ms. Shanahan indicated that she had met with the Building Inspector on October 16, 2013 to speak about what needed to be done. At that time the Building Inspector stated that the property was in a UR-A zone and she needed to have a 10 foot rear yard setback and a 5 foot side yard setback. As a result of this conversation she scaled back her rear deck and on October 21, 2013 the Building Inspector signed off on the deck footings and framing. Work then continued but on November 20, 2013, Ms. Shanahan indicated she received a letter from the Building Inspector that the deck was denied and would not be signed off on because the property was actually in an SR-B zone with different, larger required setbacks. Ms. Shanahan stated that she is now applying for a Variance from the Board of Appeals to legalize the deck they had already constructed with the direction from the Building Inspector.

Ms. Gaffey noted that the Plot Plan indicates the correct zoning district on it, SR-B. Ms. Morelli asked what the difference was in this instance between the UR-A and the SR-B zones. Ms. Shanahan indicated that in the UR-A zone the rear setback for the deck could be 10 feet and the side yard setback 5 feet because the deck was less than 4 feet in height. In the SR-A district the deck would need a 15 foot rear yard setback and a 6 foot side yard setback. Ms. Shanahan continued on to note that there are no structures between her existing rear deck and the Lynn Fells Parkway and that the neighbors seem to be very happy with the improvements they have been making to the property. Mr. Cassavoy recommended that the Applicant speak with all of the neighbors before the Board of Appeals hearing. Ms. Morelli noted that the Planning Board is simply advisory to the Board of Appeals, which is the board that makes the final decision.

Ms. Shanahan stated that she could not believe what she was reading when she received the letter. Mr. Cassidy stated that he thought this was purely an administrative issue where the Applicant was unintentionally misled by the Building Inspector. He continued on to state that he felt the Planning Board could not be usefully involved in this particular case. Ms. DeSouza-Ward noted that it is up to the Applicant to look at the appropriate zoning requirements for their property. However, this is a small issue it seems and the rear deck is not close to another dwelling and therefore Ms. DeSouza-Ward indicated she would not be opposed. Mr. Cassavoy stated that there is still 10 feet between the deck and the rear property line. Mr. Cassidy indicated that he felt a standard letter would be appropriate for this case.

Mr. Mercado noted that the Plot Plan was dated October 1, 2013, but that the Building Permits were pulled in September of 2013. Ms. Shanahan indicated that the contractor pulled the permits so she was not sure what he used for a site plan to obtain the Building Permit. Mr. Sadowski asked if the deck was part of the original Building Permit. Ms. Shanahan indicated that it was and that there used to be a small mudroom at the rear of the structure. Mr. Sadowski then indicated that he agreed with all the comments that had been made, especially those of Ms. DeSouza-Ward, but he would recommend a little more than just a standard letter.

Mr. Cassidy then MADE a MOTION to send a standard letter to the Board of Appeals which notes that there is still 10 feet between the deck and the rear property line and there is no structure on the adjacent lot between the deck and the Lynn Fells Parkway to the north. The motion also indicated that the letter should state that the Planning Board does not take objection to this proposed change nor does it appear to have a negative impact on the surrounding neighborhood. Mr. Cassavoy SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Document: ZBA Application Case # 13-028

Case # 13-029, 81 Pearl Street, Vincent Fogarty

Attorney Louis Izzi, Esq. was present on behalf of the Applicants Vincent and Judith Fogarty, who were also in attendance to discuss their application with the Planning Board. Mr. Izzi indicated that his clients are seeking to remove a three-season porch to construct an addition with a half bathroom and a kitchen. The addition would extend 10 feet deeper into the property and across the width of the existing house. Mr. Izzi also noted that the Applicants have the overwhelming support of their neighbors, including the direct abutter.

Mr. Cassavoy asked Planning Staff where the setbacks are measured; to the foundation of the building or to the overhang. Ms. Gaffey indicated that the setbacks are measured to the foundation of a structure. Ms. DeSouza-Ward stated that it appears a standard letter with no objection would be appropriate for this case as the side setback of the structure would be maintained and the addition is only one-story. Mr. Sadowski asked how high the addition would be and Mr. Izzi indicated it was 15 feet to the peak of the roof. Mr. Sadowski then asked what the exterior finish on the existing house is and what is being proposed for the siding of the addition. Mr. Izzi indicated that the existing siding is a wood shingle and the siding for the proposed addition would be the same.

Mr. Mercado noted that the Plot Plan seems to indicate the addition would be L-shaped but the floor plans seem to show a rectangular addition. Mr. Izzi explained that the addition would be somewhat L-shaped. Mr. Mercado then pointed out that the Plot Plan does not show the proposed stairway on the left side of the addition and asked if this would still meet the side yard setback. Ms. Gaffey indicated that it would because the side yard setback is only 10 feet in this zoning district. Mr. Sadowski then confirmed that 23' 9" setback on the Plot Plan is incorrect and Mr. Fogarty indicated that statement was correct because the distance from the proposed stairs to the side yard is shorter. Mr. Sadowski then pointed out to the Applicant that they want to be sure they are seeking all the necessary relief they need from the Board of Appeals so they do not have to return back before the Board at a later time.

Mr. Mercado then MADE a MOTION to send a standard letter to the Board of Appeals which notes that the Planning Board does not take objection to this proposed change nor does it appear to have a negative impact on the surrounding neighborhood. Additionally, the Planning Board would like to clarify that the Plot Plan does not display the exterior stairs which would be attached to the addition on the left side elevation. Therefore, the left side yard setback indicated on the Plot Plan is inaccurate, but even with

these stairs the proposed addition would not violate the left side yard setback. Mr. King SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Document: ZBA Application Case # 13-029

Case # 13-030, 16 Crystal Street, Daniel and Susan DiLullo

Applicants Dan and Susan DiLullo were present to discuss their application with the Planning Board. Mr. DiLullo indicated that they own 14-16 Crystal Street which includes their residence and his office. They would like to add a second floor above the portion of the structure where his office is currently located. Mr. DiLullo noted that the addition would be within the existing setback of the building; however, they do need relief from the minimum lot depth and front setback requirements.

Ms. Gaffey asked if the curb cuts for the proposed second driveway would be feasible with a utility pole being so close. Mr. DiLullo explained that they would be expanding their neighbor's curb cut all the way to the utility pole. Mr. Sadowski asked if the garage would be eliminated and Mr. DiLullo indicated that it would not be and they would also be retaining the existing curb cut which leads to that garage. Ms. DiLullo indicated that their daughter would be moving into the new addition. Mr. King asked what the height of the proposed retaining wall would be and Mr. DiLullo indicated it would be approximately 4 feet tall. There was then conversation about how far apart the existing curb cut to the garage would be from the proposed expanded curb cut. Planning Staff pointed out that two curb cuts at the same property would need to be 30 feet apart, but that the Applicant should confirm this with the Building Commissioner. Additionally, it seemed that the two tandem parking spaces would not both count towards the required additional parking spaces for the proposed new residential unit. Planning Staff also recommended that the Applicant confirm this with the Building Commissioner as well.

Mr. DiLullo indicated that they are not proposing to change anything on the existing dwelling or the garage. Ms. DiLullo stated that the neighbor on the right side of the property felt the structure would look more balanced with the proposed addition. Mr. King asked what the address would be for the proposed new dwelling and Mr. DiLullo indicated it would be 16 Crystal Street and that the whole property is currently shared space. Mr. Cassidy confirmed that the intent was not to divide the lot but to keep the property as two condominiums on the same lot. Mr. DiLullo indicated that was correct. Mr. Mercado asked if any Conservation Commission approval was required for this project and Mr. DiLullo indicated that it was required for the porch and the retaining wall according to the Building Commissioner. Mr. DiLullo continued on to note that he had a preliminary conversation with the Conversation Agent about the retaining wall. Mr. DiLullo also noted that the water leveling system that has been installed for Ell Pond has worked very well and the elevation of the pond has not changed more than a foot or so since its implementation.

Ms. Petrillo asked if a home office was permitted as of right in this zoning district. Ms. Gaffey indicated that a home occupation with only one employee, with certain conditions, is permissible as of right. Mr. Cassidy indicated that the thought the proposed project seemed sensible and was a good use of the property.

Mr. Cassidy then MADE a MOTION to send a standard letter to the Board of Appeals which notes that the Planning Board does not take objection to this proposed change which seems sensible and does not appear to have a negative impact on the surrounding neighborhood. Mr. Mercado SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Document: ZBA Application Case # 13-030

At this time City Solicitor Robert Van Campen, Esq. arrived at the meeting.

SITE PLAN REVIEW & AFFORDABLE HOUSING SPECIAL PERMIT

Case # 13-003, 2 Washington Street, WP East Development Enterprises (continued hearing)

Carolyn Zern was present for the Applicant, WP East Development Enterprises, along with the other members of the project team which included Robert Del Savio from Bargmann Hendrie + Archetype, Inc. and Attorney Michael Leon from Nutter McClennen & Fish LLP.

Ms. Morelli addressed the public just before the case was heard as she saw many new faces in attendance. She clarified the Planning Board's jurisdiction regarding the proposed project and noted that the application involved a mixed use building with 94 residential units which meets all of the density and dimensional requirements for the zoning district. She also noted that a site visit was conducted back in August and that the Planning Board has thoroughly analyzed the site layout; building materials and design; drainage, sewage, and water systems; trash removal; landscaping; and parking layout, among other items. Each of these topics had been commented on at length at previous meetings. Ms. Morelli noted that, as Chair of the Planning Board, it was her intention to bring this project to a vote at this meeting.

Ms. Zern then began by indicating that they had nothing new to present but that they were thankful to the Planning Board and those members of the public who had attended a number of meetings and provided comments. Mr. Cassavoy then stated that he wanted to open up the meeting for new public comments on the project, but also added that he felt the Planning Board had already greatly discussed all aspects of the project. Ms. Morelli noted that they had an updated list of conditions in front of them and Ms. Gaffey indicated that Planning Staff had removed some of the conditions that were redundant and tweaked the wording of a few others. Mr. Cassavoy asked Planning Staff to explain the changes to the conditions and Ms. Gaffey went over the modifications that had been made since the previous meeting. She noted that some additional acoustic language had been added, the numerical breakdown of the one- and two-bedroom units had been altered, and the wording "as needed" was added to the trash removal condition, among other clerical items. Ms. Zern spoke in regard to the trash removal condition and noted that trash pickup three times per week would not be necessary because they are now proposing to have a trash compactor inside the building which will reduce the need for the frequency at which trash is removed. Ms. Gaffey also spoke about the removal of conditions relating to the MWRA Permit, Fire Department approval, and a condition regarding the maintenance of private streets or ways.

Ms. Morelli then opened up the hearing for new public comments and asked each member who spoke to provide their name and address. She also asked that members of the public keep their comments brief, that they pertain only to new business, and that the comments be directed to the Planning Board.

Richard Greski of 23 Brazil Street stated that he had concerns that the project was too big for the area and would be too tall at 5 stories in height. He also cited concerns that the project did not have enough parking spaces but asked if the project would be advertised as being transit accessible. Mr. Greski continued on to state that the retail component will require additional parking and that the project should have two parking spaces for each dwelling unit. He also stated that he was not sure what kinds of traffic studies had been conducted for the area but he had concerns about where everyone would park. Mr. Greski indicated that the residents did not want more traffic in this neighborhood and 94 dwelling units will clearly bring in more traffic.

Steven Ciulla of 52-54 Brazil Street pointed out that three acoustic studies had been completed for the proposed project. The first one indicated that the acoustic levels would exceed the maximum allowable level specified by the City Ordinance. The second study indicated that the acoustic levels would be right

at the ordinance maximum and the third indicated that the sound levels should be below the allowable maximum level with the implementation of acoustic screening. Mr. Ciulla wanted to ensure that the most recent acoustic study was referenced in one of the conditions to ensure the Applicant would keep sound levels from the project below the maximum allowable level as indicated in the City Ordinance.

John Matheson, the Ward 3 Alderman from Malden, of 15 Bowen Street in Malden, indicated that he had concerns about the traffic study. He stated that it appeared the study was indicating that 400-500 new daily trips would be generated as a result of the project and he had serious concerns about these figures. Alderman Matheson also stated that he had concerns about the planned roadway improvements for the Washington Street / Pleasant Street intersection and also asked if there were any plans to address any of the intersections in Malden that would be impacted by this project.

Valerie Austras of 70 Brazil Street indicated that she agreed with everything Mr. Greski had stated. She felt the project was too big and too high for the area.

Alan Brown of 38 Pleasant Street stated that he would like to address the minutes and what was recorded from the November 18, 2013 Planning Board meeting. He felt there were some differences between what he thought occurred at the meeting and what was noted in the minutes. Mr. Brown noted that the Applicant is referred to as Wood Partners in the minutes but the application indicates that WP East Development Enterprises is the Applicant. Mr. Brown also questioned who was referenced as the Applicant and developer for the project at Stone Place. Ms. Morelli indicated that Wood Partners acquired rights to the Stone Place project after it had gone through the planning approval process. Mr. Brown then stated that he felt the traffic study completed by Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. did not mention the Pleasant Street intersection at Stone Place. He indicated that he felt this intersection was extremely relevant the proposed project at 2 Washington Street and questioned how it could have been overlooked.

Mr. Brown then asked if he was going to get responses to his questions and Ms. Morelli indicated that the Planning Board would address his comments during their deliberation. Mr. Brown then asked why the merits of the Applicant could not be taken into consideration when determining approval for a project. Ms. Morelli indicated that land use case law in Massachusetts prohibits boards and committees from looking at the merits of an Applicant in determining planning approval for a project. Mr. Duchesneau cited the Dowd vs. Board of Appeals of Dover (5 Mass. App. Ct. 148) case as a reference to this determination. Mr. Brown then asked what the legal definition is for "merits of an Applicant"? Mr. Van Campen indicated that question could be looked into but he also stated that he felt the merits of the Applicant were defined by the Planning Board Chair earlier in the meeting. Ms. Morelli then briefly covered the application criteria for Site Plan Review from Section 235-16.1 in the Melrose Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Brown then noted that there were discrepancies between the draft November 18, 2013 Planning Board meeting minutes he had printed out from MinuteTraq on the City's website and the draft minutes he had received upon request from the Office of Planning and Community Development. Mr. Duchesneau explained that the minutes posted to MinuteTraq on the City's website were simply draft minutes and changes had been made to the minutes prior to them being distributed to the Planning Board members. The draft minutes that Mr. Brown had received directly from the Office of Planning and Community Development upon request were the minutes that the Planning Board had reviewed and approved earlier in the meeting. Mr. Brown then asked again about why the Pleasant Street / Stone Place intersection was not covered in the traffic study and Ms. Gaffey indicated that this intersection actually was included as part of the traffic study.

Susan Merenda of 121 Washington Street stated that she felt the traffic in the area would double as a result of this project. She asked what will happen to Malden and the surrounding neighborhood if the traffic in the area is increased by this much.

David Merenda of 121 Washington Street stated that he felt the project was enormous and that the neighborhood did not want it. He indicated he felt the public had no say in the matter but noted that they were not going away any time soon.

Debbie Mathison of 39 Glen Rock Avenue in Malden inquired about Condition # 24. She noted that there is already a flooding issue in Patchell Park and asked how much the water from the melting snow storage pile would impact the drainage at Patchell Park. Ms. Mathison also asked how large the snow pile will be allowed to get before snow is required to be removed off-site.

Mr. Cassidy then MADE a MOTION to close the public comment portion of the meeting. Mr. Mercado SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed and Ms. Petrillo abstained from the vote.

Mr. Cassavoy stated that he had looked at the Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. traffic study and the 2018 projections under build-out and no build-out conditions for the project. He felt that the amount of traffic increase to the surrounding intersections in the area is de minimis. Mr. Cassavoy felt that residents of the proposed project would behave similarly to those at the Oak Grove project where the number of transit users exceeded projections for the development. Ms. Gaffey then clarified that there is no mitigation proposed for any of the intersections around the project. She also noted that she and Mayor Dolan have had conversations with Malden officials including Mayor Christianson's staff. The concerns expressed pertained to drainage, blasting, the tree buffer for Patchell Park, the retail use and the impact of increased use of the MBTA. There was no concern expressed pertaining to traffic at Malden intersections. Ms. DeSouza-Ward asked how the parking assignments would be allocated for the project. Ms. Zern indicated that parking in the garage would have specifically assigned spaces and that the surface parking spaces would be closely monitored to ensure they are being used by residents or retail customers.

Ms. Morelli asked how snow removal would be handled. Ms. Zern indicated that they anticipate trucking snow off of the project site when the stored snow begins to impact the functionality of the surface parking spaces. She continued on to note that she did not know of a specific snowfall amount which would trigger snow removal from the site. Mr. Mercado stated that he would recommend a 20 foot buffer from the property line be implemented for snow storage purposes and to limit the height of the snow pile to 6 feet. Mr. Sadowski noted that the Planning Board often does not have a condition for a parking area for a development, but it is up to the Board's discretion.

Mr. Cassidy noted that the grade rises from the snow storage area upwards towards Patchell Park and therefore any water drainage from the snow pile would stay on-site. He then indicated drainage from the project site to Patchell Park is not a credible concern but it is appropriate to consider. Ms. DeSouza-Ward asked what other members thought about Mr. Mercado's suggestion of not permitting snow storage within 20 feet of the property boundary. Mr. Sadowski noted that one of the conditions requires that snow be trucked off-site when it starts to infringe upon the on-site parking spaces and therefore he felt it may not be necessary.

Mr. Del Savio pointed out that the vegetated areas at the south and southwestern portions of the site along the property boundary would be retained. Mr. Merenda asked how many trees would be taken down as part of this project and Mr. Del Savio indicated about 8-10 trees in the southwest area of the site would

need to be removed for project construction. Ms. Morelli then asked the Board if all of the questions had been covered and the Board members agreed they had discussed all the topics.

Mr. Cassidy stated that with respect to Wood Partners, he has worked with them on other projects as part of his professional career and they were a commendable firm and good neighbors. He also noted that he felt there is simply not enough room at every project site to have two parking spaces for each dwelling unit and stated that the world does not work this way anymore. Mr. Cassidy continued on to note that the threat of not having enough parking spaces would be off-set by the proximity of the project to the Oak Grove Orange Line station. He felt that the parking ratio for the project is appropriate. Ms. Morelli stated that there is now good data which shows that more people are taking advantage of mass transit options.

Mr. Mercado asked about the history of Town Estates on Pleasant Street and Ms. Gaffey indicated that the project was constructed a long time ago under a different planning/building review process. Mr. Sadowski pointed out that the case before the Planning Board does not require any Variances or other zoning relief. He also noted that the property owner still has the right to build a project using the underlying zoning which is industrial. Mr. Welch stated that he felt the Board had discussed this project at length and that they were now in a position to be able to vote on it. Mr. Mercado asked what the construction timeframe was for the project and Ms. Zern stated that the plan was to start construction in the winter/spring of 2014 and they were anticipating a 14 to 16 month construction period.

Mr. Cassavoy then MADE a MOTION to approve the Applicant's request for an Affordable Housing Incentive Program Special Permit, with conditions, which would require the developer to create and maintain 9 affordable dwelling units to be dispersed throughout the building. Mr. Welch SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed and Ms. Petrillo abstained from the vote.

Mr. Cassavoy then MADE a MOTION to approve the Applicant's request for Site Plan Review approval with the conditions that were discussed. Ms. DeSouza-Ward SECONDED the MOTION and also opened the motion for discussion.

Mr. Mercado stated that he would like to add a condition which prohibits snow storage within 15 feet of the property boundary for the project. Ms. DeSouza-Ward asked why there should be a limitation to their ability to store snow on-site. Mr. Mercado stated that the snow will be pushed outside the parking area which could impact surrounding properties as it accumulates over the winter. Mr. Sadowski asked if the melting snow would drain on or off-site and Mr. Cassavoy confirmed it would drain on-site. Ms. Morelli indicated that she did not feel this was a necessary condition. The Planning Board then took a vote to amend Condition # 24 to add language which would create a 15 foot snow storage buffer in the southwestern corner of the property. All members voted in favor of amending the condition. None were opposed and Ms. Petrillo abstained from the vote.

Mr. Mercado then MADE a MOTION to approve the Applicant's request for Site Plan Review approval with the conditions as discussed, including the additional language regarding the snow storage buffer. Ms. DeSouza-Ward SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed and Ms. Petrillo abstained from the vote.

OTHER

44-48 Grove Street, Minor Modifications to Medical/Professional Office Building

Ms. Gaffey explained that the building at 44-48 Grove Street is now being framed and the Applicant, Shihchi Shieh, is seeking approval for alterations to the Grove Street façade to add more windows. Currently, there are a number of solid panels on this facade and she would like to remove these panels and

make them transparent windows. Mr. Sadowski stated that the Planning Board has talked about changes like this before and they seem very minor.

Ms. Gaffey also noted that the Applicant would like to eliminate the dumpster from the approved Site Plan to alleviate concerns regarding the support of the underground culvert at the site. The Applicant would like to relocate the trash area to the north side of the building and use roll-away trash containers, which are much lighter, instead of a dumpster.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward then MADE a MOTION to approve the Applicant's request to implement more windows on the Grove Street façade and to allow for trash receptacles instead of an on-site dumpster. Mr. Cassidy also added to the motion that the Applicant be required to center the Main Street door in the entryway between the columns. Mr. Sadowski also wanted to ensure that the correspondence to the Applicant and the Building Commissioner clearly indicated that the Planning Board is only approving the window and trash area changes and that the Applicant should otherwise adhere to the originally approved plans. Mr. Mercado SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

The meeting adjourned at 10:10 PM.