

**MELROSE PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
Special Meeting and Public Hearing
Monday, November 4, 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, John Sadowski, and Jack Welch

ABSENT: Sharon Petrillo

Denise Gaffey, Director and City Planner, and Adam Duchesneau, Assistant Planning Director, were present.

The meeting was called to order at 7:52 PM by Ms. Morelli.

MINUTES

Regular Meeting, September 23, 2013

Mr. Cassidy MADE a MOTION to accept the minutes of September 23, 2013. Mr. Mercado SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed, Mr. Cassavoy abstained from the vote, and Mr. King and Mr. Sadowski were absent from the vote.

Special Meeting, October 7, 2013

Mr. Cassidy MADE a MOTION to accept the minutes of October 7, 2013. Mr. Welch SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed and Mr. King and Mr. Sadowski were absent from the vote

At this time Mr. Sadowski arrived at the meeting.

BOARD OF APPEALS

Case # 13-025, 985 Main Street/8 Reading Hill Avenue, Nelson Pan and Debra Hong Pan

Thomas Mullen, Esq. was present on behalf of the Applicants to discuss the application with the Planning Board along with project Engineer James Hanley. Mr. Mullen indicated that his clients own the property at 8 Reading Hill Avenue as well as the dental practice at 985 Main Street. The Applicants recently received Site Plan Review approval and a Slope Protection Special Permit from the Planning Board on August 26, 2013. They are now requesting zoning relief in the form of Variances to allow for greater than 20% impervious surface and parking spaces in the front yard of a single-family residence at 8 Reading Hill Avenue. Additionally, the Applicants are also seeking a Variance and/or Special Permit or finding to authorize the extension of a nonconforming use to allow additional access to and parking for the property at 985 Main Street across the 8 Reading Hill Avenue property. Mr. Mullen indicated that a previously dilapidated garage which straddles the property line has been removed and the dental practice is improving their parking area with four formalized spaces. The only place to put two parking spaces on the property at 8 Reading Hill Avenue is in the front yard which requires a Variance.

Mr. Mullen noted that their request for a Building Permit was denied not only for the front yard parking issue but also due to the fact that their plan would exceed the 20% maximum of impervious surface for the building front yard. Additionally, the expansion of the nonconforming dental use (via the expanded parking area) was another item behind the denial of their Building Permit. Mr. Mullen indicated that there is an incredible slope of land at the site and because the parking needs to be located at the front of the

property at 8 Reading Hill Avenue, there is really no way they can reduce their impervious material down to 20% in the front yard.

Mr. Welch asked if there was any reason why pervious pavers could not be used for the proposed parking spaces at 8 Reading Hill Avenue. Mr. Hanley indicated that the openings in pervious pavers which allow for percolation tend to become clogged with debris and sand over time and they do not seem to provide the benefit they are intended too. Mr. Cassavoy noted that this is a small residential lot and he felt this was the ideal situation in which to use pervious pavers. He felt that with the small amount of area the pervious pavers would cover, there should be less sanding and therefore less maintenance of the pavers would be required. Mr. Mercado noted that there are pervious asphalt pavers available as well as pervious asphalt which could work well at this property in this particular instance. Mr. Hanley stated he has seen how difficult it is for larger companies to maintain areas with pervious pavers and he felt that it did not seem realistic to have pervious pavers at a single-family dwelling property.

Mr. Mercado indicated that he has seen developments with pervious asphalt and/or pavers where the rainwater will go right through the pavement material. Ms. Morelli confirmed that the pervious and impervious surface percentage calculations were correct. She noted that if the two proposed parking spaces and the walkway from the house were changed to pervious pavers, they could likely meet the 20% maximum impervious area requirement. Mr. Hanley indicated that they had looked at doing this but unfortunately they would come up just short of reducing the impervious area to 20% even with this change. Additionally, the Applicants were not sure if pervious pavers in parking spaces would count towards pervious area in Melrose, but Ms. Gaffey confirmed that the pavers would count towards pervious area in Melrose.

Ms. Morelli asked if the Applicants were not granted the Variance to be permitted to have more than 20% impervious area in the front yard would the project be infeasible. Mr. Hanley stated that even if they made the parking spaces pervious, they would still be above the maximum 20% impervious area requirement and therefore, it would be problematic for the project. Ms. DeSouza-Ward pointed out that given the Planning Board had approved their Site Plan and Slope Protection Special Permit, she thought it would be inconsistent for the Board to not support the expansion of the use. Additionally, Ms. DeSouza-Ward indicated that the two front yard parking spaces seemed to make sense at this particular lot under these circumstances. She went on to note that the only issue seemed to be the impervious area topic.

Ms. Morelli asked if a use Variance or Special Permit would be required for the medical use in the residential zone and Ms. DeSouza-Ward indicated that she thought it was up to the Board of Appeals to determine. Ms. DeSouza-Ward also noted that she would be supportive of the requests to expand the nonconforming use and for the front yard parking spaces at 8 Reading Hill Avenue. Mr. Sadowski asked what the long term intent was for the single-family home and Mr. Mullen indicated that it would remain a single-family home and be sold as such in the future by the Applicants. Mr. Mullen went on to note that an easement will be placed on the 8 Reading Hill Avenue property to allow access to the parking area at 985 Main Street and none of the property lines will be altered.

Mr. Sadowski pointed out that another way to view this would be noting that there are plenty of other examples in Melrose where there are front yard parking spaces at single-family dwellings. However, he went on to indicate that he did not like the idea of two curb cuts being so close together. Mr. Cassavoy indicated that he agreed with Mr. Sadowski and Ms. DeSouza-Ward. He felt that the pervious material issue was important and this project should attempt to meet the requirement of the zoning ordinance as much as possible. Mr. Cassavoy continued on to say that he thought the Planning Board should issue a recommendation letter that speaks to the impervious area topic. Mr. Cassidy stated that he felt the pervious surface topic is more than academic in this case due to the extreme slope at the site.

Mr. Cassavoy then MADE a MOTION to send a letter to the Board of Appeals which supports the expansion of the nonconforming use, cites the fact that there are numerous other examples in Melrose of front yard parking at single-family dwellings, and requests that the Applicants use pervious paver materials for the two parking spaces at 8 Reading Hill Avenue to make the project as compliant as possible to the 20% maximum impervious area in the building front yard requirement. Mr. Cassidy requested that wording to the effect of "in the interest of public safety with respect to the adjacent roadway" be added to the recommendation letter as part of the motion. Mr. Mercado SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed and Mr. King was absent from the vote.

Document: ZBA Application Case # 13-025

Case # 13-026, 308 East Foster Street, Robin Peevey and Carol Ann Licitra

Applicants Robin Peevey and Carol Ann Licitra were present to discuss their application with the Planning Board along with contractor Mike Sylvia. Ms. Peevey explained that the house is currently a two-bedroom dwelling and they would like to put a second floor rear addition on the structure to make it a three-bedroom dwelling. To do this they need relief from the Board of Appeals from the side yard setback requirement as they only have approximately four feet of setback along the left property line.

Mr. Sadowski asked if the materials of the proposed addition are intended to match those of the existing structure. Mr. Sylvia indicated that was correct and they would be using red cedar shingles and a similar roofing material. Mr. Cassavoy noted that every lot in the area is pretty much the exact same size and shape. He went on to note that the house itself appears to have a very nice, steep gable roof while the proposed pitch of the roof on the addition is much more shallow. Mr. Cassavoy felt that matching the pitch of the roof on the existing structure would be very beneficial to the aesthetics of the dwelling. He noted that simply mimicking the pitch of the roof just one frame back would help to relate the addition to the rest of the existing structure. Mr. Cassavoy noted that this would be a bit more money but that it will look much better than a more shallow pitched roof. Mr. Sylvia indicated that a detail could be worked into the rear portion of the addition to reflect the pitch on the existing structure.

Mr. Mercado inquired about the Plot Plan and how it was completed 15 years ago. He asked the Applicants if they had a more recent survey of the property. The Applicants indicated that they did not, but that there had been no changes to the footprints of the structures since that time. Mr. Sadowski indicated that he thought there was a requirement in the zoning ordinance that called for a recent land survey to be included as part of the application, but he also thought that in this particular case a standard letter of recommendation could be sent along to the Board of Appeals. Ms. Morelli informed the Applicants that they may want to double check with the Building Commissioner that the Plot Plan they had submitted would be sufficient for their Building Permit application. Mr. Sylvia indicated that they had been told by the Building Commissioner to use this particular Plot Plan.

Mr. Sadowski then MADE a MOTION to send a standard letter to the Board of Appeals which, per Mr. Cassavoy's recommendation, notes that the Applicants have agreed to reevaluate the design of the roof slope of the rear addition to create a faux slope to match the more steeply pitched portions of the existing structure's roofline. Ms. DeSouza-Ward SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed and Mr. King was absent from the vote.

Document: ZBA Application Case # 13-026

At this time Mr. King 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., Robert Clarke from Allen & Major Associates, Inc., Matt Kealey from Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc., David Walsh from Hammer & Walsh Design, and Jeff Fullerton from Acentech. Ms. Zern began by stating that she thought the project team had made some good strides in addressing the concerns and comments from the last Planning Board meeting. She indicated that questions about the rear retaining wall, parking, driveway location, and the Acoustic Peer Review would all be covered during this meeting. Ms. Zern also noted that they would be more than happy to provide space for the installation of radio repeaters within the proposed project for the Fire and Police Departments.

Mr. Walsh began by presenting the updates to the landscape plans and materials. He indicated that the southwest corner of the property will maintain the existing grade of the site. The retaining wall at the rear of the property will have arborvitae on top of it for screening which will be 6 to 7 feet tall when installed, planted 3 feet apart on center, and will grow between 8 and 14 inches per year. Mr. Walsh also noted that there will be additional plantings to supplement the screening vegetation. Mr. Sadowski asked if the existing trees at the property were labeled on the Landscape Plan and Mr. Walsh indicated that they were, including their caliper. Mr. Cassavoy asked if a fence would be implemented along the rear property line and Mr. Walsh indicated that there is an existing fence that would be replaced. Mr. Cassavoy then asked if the proposed junipers could be staggered at all to make their planting pattern look more natural. Mr. Del Savio indicated that they took the proposed pattern from the zoning code guidelines. Ms. Morelli noted that while the zoning code does specify the plantings be 3 feet on center, it does not require the plantings to be in a straight row. Mr. Walsh stated that the arborvitae planted at 3 feet on center will grow together but they will still reach their full height at maturity. He continued on to note that he probably would have planted them at 5 feet on center if he had a choice.

Mr. Mercado asked how tall the new plantings would be when implemented and Mr. Walsh indicated they would be about 6 feet in height. Mr. Mercado noted that it appears from Section A-1 that the existing vegetation seems to already screen the proposed building and Mr. Walsh indicated that was correct as there is some dense vegetation in the area currently. Mr. Cassidy asked if there was enough depth on top of the retaining wall at the rear of the property to stagger the plantings and Mr. Walsh indicated there was enough space. Mr. Mercado pointed out that another fence may need to be implemented at the very top of the retaining wall due to its height and the Applicant should check on this. Mr. Cassavoy indicated that he felt this is the Building Commissioner's purview. Mr. Cassidy asked how the parking lot landscaping would be handled and Mr. Walsh indicated that red oaks would be used in the islands along with a creeper understory. Mr. Mercado asked if there was going to be an irrigation system for the plantings and Mr. Walsh indicated that there would be.

Mr. Del Savio then gave an overview of the changes they had made to the façade of the building since the last Planning Board meeting. He indicated that they attempted to add more brick to the façade, create an iconic architectural feature, and attempted to create a design element at the corner of the building to help wrap the project into the site. Mr. Del Savio noted that they were somewhat limited by the maximum height allowance in the district and could not increase the height of the building much further. They attempted to create a rhythm of bays across the façade of the building and incorporate a cement block detailing around the entrance way. Mr. Del Savio stated they also tried to carry the metal and cement block elements down to the ground level to help break up the length of the façade.

Mr. Cassidy confirmed that the brick masonry extends all the way to the roof line on either side of the main entrance and Mr. Del Savio indicated this was correct. Mr. Cassidy also noted that he thought the

Arriscraft material was very successful on the façade of the building as it does not read like siding. Mr. Del Savio noted that bringing the Arriscraft material down to the ground at the southeast corner of the building seems to be successful. Mr. Cassavoy asked what the fence along the Malden property line would consist of and Mr. Del Savio indicated it would be a wood stockade fence. Mr. Cassidy then indicated that he felt like the corner element in the southeast corner of the building, which is an important architectural aspect of the overall structure, felt somewhat ungrounded or as if it was floating. He continued on to note that this corner element may work better in the overall design of the building if it extended all the way to the ground. Mr. King noted that he felt the Arriscraft material could be used to help extend this design element to the ground.

Mr. Cassidy asked if the ground floor units along Washington Street would have dedicated front yards and Mr. Del Savio indicated that was the case. Mr. Cassidy then asked what was being proposed for landscaping to distinguish these areas as private spaces from the public way along Washington Street. Mr. Walsh indicated that patios with inkberry hedges would be used along with Corinthian Lindens for the street trees to designate the front yards for the first floor units. Ms. Morelli noted that the doors shown on the elevation look rather commercial in nature. Mr. Cassidy indicated he would like to see a more defined separation of the ground floor unit patios from the public roadway area. He felt that creating some type of architectural barrier or element would be more successful in establishing these areas as private spaces than any form of landscaping.

Ms. Morelli noted that there were now five different colors of materials on the proposed façade and she indicated that she preferred the quietness of the original façade design. She asked why so many materials were being added to the new façade design. Mr. Del Savio indicated that more materials would provide a way to help visually break up the length of the façade of the building. Ms. Morelli stated that she preferred the similar darker tones together. She continued on to note that this is a neighborhood that has a red brick palette and at Alta Stone Place there is a warmer brick. She felt that all of the projects in the Washington Street area are adding up to form a neighborhood in a district. Ms. Morelli then noted that there are so many different kinds of panels on the proposed façade for the 2 Washington Street project but she would prefer to see a simpler palette for the building with fewer colors. She also stated how this project is an important building because it is the bookend of the Smart Growth District.

Mr. Cassavoy indicated that he preferred how the proposed design has a “Main Street” feel to it and this should help the area to act more like a “Main Street” in a downtown. Ms. Morelli added that in thinking about the corner coffee shop, there is an opportunity here to have some nice outside seating. Mr. Cassidy stated that he felt the color renderings really emphasize the color differences in the materials but in reality the color changes will likely be much more subtle. Mr. King added that the renderings make the material colors look drastically different but he did not think the actual difference in the materials would be that stark. Mr. Cassidy indicated that he would like to see a brick building with some subtle color applied around it. Mr. Del Savio, when asked by Mr. Cassidy, indicated that he was leaning more towards having the brick run across the entire length of the base of the building. However, Mr. Del Savio added that he wanted to look at some alternate materials around the entry corner detail. Ms. Zern asked how many of these details could be handled at the Design Review Subcommittee level as opposed to at the Planning Board meeting and Ms. Gaffey indicated that a lot of these design items would be better handled at the subcommittee level.

Mr. Clarke then presented the engineering and site plan changes that had been made as a result of the peer review recommendations. He noted the three major items that the peer review recommended which were additional test pits at the site to look at the permeability and seasonal water table highs, a curb bump out for the crosswalk at the southeastern portion of the site, and adjusting the driveway location to increase the distance from the former Registry site’s driveway. Mr. Clarke noted that they looked at flipping the

parking from one side of the entrance/exit driveway to the other which resulted in two different driveway design renditions; one with an S-shape and the other being a straight shot. He noted that most developments in this area have driveways that are very close to one another already.

With regard to the undergrounding of the utilities for the project, Mr. Clarke noted that they would have to dig down approximately 10 feet to clear the MWRA utility lines and therefore they are simply leaning towards having an overhead utility connection to the property. Additionally, National Grid was not enthusiastic about the utilities being located underground beneath their utility lines. Mr. Mercado asked about potentially insulating the existing conduit and Mr. Clarke indicated that National Grid still wanted 30 inches of cover over the utilities along with 10 inches of space from their utility line. These requirements could simply not be met. Mr. Cassidy asked where things stood with regard to the bump out for the crosswalk and Mr. Clarke indicated that one will be implemented on the west side of Washington Street. A bump out cannot be implemented on the east side of Washington Street because this entire lane width is for the travel lane.

Mr. Cassidy indicated that he did not prefer the two driveway alternatives that were presented because in both instances it would cause the loss of the patio area outside of the corner retail space. Mr. Mercado asked if any parking spaces were lost with either of the proposed driveway alternatives and Mr. Clarke indicated they would still have 133 parking spaces in both scenarios. Ms. Morelli then asked the Planning Board if everyone thought they should disregard the two proposed driveway alternatives and all the Board members agreed that they preferred the originally proposed driveway location.

Mr. Fullerton discussed the acoustic computer analysis that was completed for the rooftop equipment. He noted that the analysis took into account the elevation of the building as well as the topography of the surrounding area. The original study had looked at all of the condensing units as if they were all 3 ton pieces of equipment, but Mr. Fullerton noted that the updated analysis looked at the use of 3 ton, 2 ton (about half of the units), and 1.5 ton condensers mixed together. Mr. Fullerton noted that no screening or acoustic fencing was taken into account for the study and the results showed that the dBA would be 40 at the neighboring residences with all the equipment operating at full capacity. Mr. Fullerton noted that the peer review indicated that Acentech approached the study with the appropriate computer modeling and that the sound levels were based on the manufacturer's data. He also noted that the peer review indicates that the condensers turning on and off could create more noise and be rather annoying to abutters. Mr. Fullerton refuted this claim because in his experience the rattle and transient sound created by new technology condensers is not nearly as severe as the older condenser units.

Mr. Mercado noted that the peer review recommends some type acoustic screening for the condensing units on the rooftop. Mr. Fullerton indicated that the report encourages this to address transient noise concerns and to provide an extra margin of safety to prevent the noise from exceeding 40 dBA at the neighboring residences. Mr. Cassidy then asked Mr. Fullerton to explain the "sound power level". Mr. Fullerton indicated that the sound power level asks you to look at the environment around the site to assess what sound will be at the neighboring properties. Ms. Morelli asked what Mr. Fullerton would recommend in the form of acoustic shielding. Mr. Fullerton indicated that anything that is light, stiff, and solid which blocks the line of site to the condensing units would work well and should reduce the sound by approximately 5 decibels. Ms. Morelli asked if only the closest row of condensing units to the residences should be shielded and Mr. Fullerton indicated that wrapping around the corners of the condensing unit field would also be helpful.

Ms. Morelli noted that 40 dBA is the maximum allowable noise level so it seems that acoustic fencing would be appropriate in this instance. Mr. Fullerton noted that the study was run under worst case scenario conditions with 100% of the condensing units running at full operating capacity. He went on to

note that a 75% operating level is much more typical for condensing units and it would be very rare that all of the equipment would be running at 100% capacity at any given time. Mr. Welch asked if the direction of the noise was taken into consideration. Mr. Fullerton stated that they do not get that information from the manufacturers so they assume equal sound radiation in every direction. Mr. Cassavoy asked if the prevailing wind was considered and Mr. Fullerton stated that the study was run under still wind conditions. If the wind was blowing towards the residences, it would increase the dBA at the adjacent residences by a few decibels Mr. Fullerton indicated.

Ms. Morelli then opened up the meeting to those members of the public who wished to provide comments on the project. She asked that each speaker introduce themselves and not be repetitive with their comments.

Steven Ciulla of 52-54 Brazil Street stated he has reviewed the plans and the acoustic study and he thought the acoustic peer review came to a very different conclusion than the original study. He noted that the peer review indicates the noise levels produced by the condensing units would be slightly above the maximum allowable dBA. Mr. Ciulla also indicated that the peer review also looks at the cycling of the condensing units turning on and off at different times of the day and notes that this could create a nuisance. He continued on to say that while there are no windows on the second floor of his structure there are skylights and noise would penetrate through these skylights. Mr. Ciulla continued on to say that in the Staff Report the Applicant indicates that no sound barriers would be required. Mr. Ciulla then stated that he had heard a lot about sound and traffic impacts but nothing about the impacts of lighting from the project. He wanted to know how much light would be emitted from the project and how it would fall onto the project site and the abutting properties. Lastly, Mr. Ciulla noted that he had concerns about the project's impact on his property value and felt that this project could bring about a substantial decrease in the value of his property. Mr. Ciulla then submitted a letter of written testimony for the record.

Alderman Gail Infurna then spoke about a variety of aspects for the project. She inquired about snow removal and asked when snow is packed too high will it be removed from the site. The Applicant indicated that was correct. She went on to note that she preferred the façade design with the brick running across the entire bottom of the building but also preferred less colors on the façade. She felt that more colors and materials on the building made it look somewhat plastic or artificial and indicated that there are not many, or any, buildings like this in Melrose. Alderman Infurna also added that she wanted to see more brick going up the façade of the building as well. She appreciated the neighbors' concerns about the condensing units and wanted to make sure that the City is doing everything it can to make this the best project possible for the community. Alderman Infurna also indicated she felt outdoor seating in this area would be a great addition. Other items she wanted to be sure were addressed were the location of the dumpster and the lighting of the parking area. She noted that she did not want to come back in 10 years and see that these items were a problem.

William D'Amore of Wakefield, whose mother-in-law lives at 18 Brazil Street, asked for further clarification about the snow storage as the area that has been designated for storage could potentially be completely blocked by parked vehicles. Mr. D'Amore also asked about the hydrant test and noted that the tests are usually run at peak times and not in the mid-afternoon. He felt that between 6:30 AM to 7:30 AM and between 5:30 PM and 7:00 PM were more accurate peak times that would give a more true reading. Mr. D'Amore also wanted to make sure that the potential development of the former Registry site, 37 Washington Street, and the area behind Alta Stone Place were taken into consideration. He also asked if there were holding tanks for the infiltration system, if there were safeguards in place if the system fails, and asked if the system failed, could the City go in and fix it. Mr. D'Amore noted that it should be indicated in the Maintenance Plan the number of times the infiltration system should be cleaned out. He

closed by stating that he thought that the acoustic shielding for the condensing units should be required for the project.

Mr. Clarke noted that the inspection times for the hydrant tests are dictated by the City so they have no control over when the testing times are determined. He also noted that there are areas in the infiltration system that can be vacuumed out periodically to keep the system operating appropriately and that the system is a private system. Ms. Gaffey asked Mr. Clarke to address the snow storage issue as it appeared a row of cars could park at the back of the lot and completely block access to the area proposed for snow storage. Mr. Mercado indicated that the management company could temporarily block off a few spaces to allow for access to the snow storage area and this topic was more of a management issue that needed to be resolved. Ms. Gaffey also pointed out that they could probably double park in the garage temporarily as well. Ms. Morelli asked Mr. Mercado what type of plow or loader would be used in this case to remove snow and Mr. Mercado indicated that a loader or some type of heavy equipment would be required.

Mr. Clarke then noted that the sewer for the project is tied into the MWRA line and there is a one-time Inflow and Infiltration payment that will be made City to cover the cost of the increased impact on the MWRA line. Ms. Morelli asked about the trash disposal and Mr. Clarke indicated that the trash area has been moved inside the building to a trash room that will have a compactor and roll away containers. Ms. Zern added that trash will be picked up three times per week as it is at Alta Stone Place. Mr. Clarke also noted that the project will use cut off light fixtures and be dark skies complaint in terms of lighting with zero foot candles at the edges of the property. Mr. Mercado asked if any chemical testing of the soil had been undertaken and Ms. Zern indicated that they are comfortable with the condition of the soil on-site. Ms. DeSouza-Ward asked if the acoustical screening should be added more for the visual aspect of the shielding. Mr. Cassavoy felt that the condensing units would not be able to be seen and the acoustic fencing would mostly be for sound.

Mr. Cassavoy then MADE a MOTION to continue the public comment portion of the hearing to the next Planning Board meeting. Mr. Mercado SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Jim Ward, the Applicant's attorney from Nutter McClennen & Fish LLP, asked if it would now be appropriate to begin discussing conditions for the project. Ms. Morelli indicated that the Planning Board would undertake this at the next meeting. Mr. Cassavoy noted that it seemed like the Planning Board was leaning towards simply retaining the originally proposed location for the driveway. Jeff Maxtutis, from AECOM, who was also in attendance with Kathy Schaeffer from AECOM, noted that the proposed driveway location is tight, and not necessarily desirable, but there are always tradeoffs with projects. Ms. DeSouza-Ward pointed out that in AECOM's peer review memo it was suggested that a condition be included that the Applicant speak with the property owner of the former Registry site to coordinate a driveway location for that property if it were to ever be redeveloped. Mr. Maxtutis noted that it would be very difficult to give a condition such as this any kind of teeth.

Mr. Cassavoy then MADE a MOTION to continue the 2 Washington Street (Case # 13-003) hearing to the Planning Board's Special Meeting on Monday, November 18, 2013 at 7:45 PM. Mr. Mercado SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

NEXT MEETINGS

The Planning Board members then discussed their meeting schedule for the remainder of the year. The Board members agreed that they would hold the Monday November 18, 2013 Special Meeting in lieu of their originally scheduled Regular Meeting on Monday, November 25, 2013. Additionally, the members

of the Planning Board also agreed to hold a Special Meeting on Monday, December 16, 2013 in lieu of their originally scheduled Regular Meeting on Monday, December 23, 2013.

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 PM.