

**MELROSE PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
Special Meeting and Public Hearing
Monday, July 29, 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, and Adam Duchesneau, Assistant Planning Director, were present.

The meeting was called to order at 7:53 PM by Ms. Morelli.

MINUTES

Regular Meeting, June 24, 2013

Mr. Cassidy MADE a MOTION to accept the minutes of June 24, 2013. Mr. Mercado SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed, Ms. DeSouza-Ward and Ms. Petrillo were absent from the vote.

Design Review Subcommittee Meeting, July 15, 2013

Mr. Mercado MADE a MOTION to accept the minutes of July 15, 2013. Mr. Cassidy SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed, Mr. Sadowski abstained, Ms. DeSouza-Ward and Ms. Petrillo were absent from the vote.

Joint Public Hearing, July 15, 2013

Mr. Mercado MADE a MOTION to accept the minutes of July 15, 2013. Mr. Welch SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed, Mr. Sadowski abstained, Ms. DeSouza-Ward and Ms. Petrillo were absent from the vote.

Mr. Mercado asked when the Board of Aldermen would be voting on the proposed zoning amendments and Ms. Gaffey replied that the date had not yet been scheduled.

At this time, Ms. DeSouza-Ward and Ms. Petrillo arrived at the meeting.

ASSENT CALENDAR

Case # 13-015, 35 Forest Street, Scott Weaver and Stacy Macdonald

The contractor for the project, Everett Mitchell of Mitchell Design and Construction, was in attendance on behalf of the Applicants. Ms. Morelli explained the situation to Mr. Mitchell and why the case had been placed on the Assent Calendar. Mr. Cassavoy MADE a MOTION to send a standard letter to the Board of Appeals. Mr. Welch SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Document: ZBA Application Case # 13-015

BOARD OF APPEALS

Case # 13-016, 47 Heywood Avenue, Marie Bonneau and Martin Tremblay

The Applicants, Marie Bonneau and Martin Tremblay, were in attendance along with their architect, Leah Greenwald. Ms. Bonneau indicated that she and her husband Martin had lived in Melrose for eight years and they have two children, eight and ten year old boys. They enjoy living in the Heywood Avenue neighborhood but they need a bit more space in their current home which is why they are proposing this addition. Ms. Greenwald then went over the site plan for the property to show why the couple was proposing an additional story for the structure as opposed to a first floor, horizontal addition. Ms. Greenwald pointed out that the property is located where Heywood Avenue ends and restarts, and therefore the property technically does not have a “front” yard that faces Heywood Avenue. She went on to note that the ground floor of the building includes a garage, family room, utility space, and bathroom. The second floor of the structure has an apartment style layout with a living room, dining room, kitchen, and two small bedrooms. Ms. Greenwald noted that her clients wanted to make a master bedroom with more privacy and a master bath. They also wanted to add some additional storage as well as office space. Ms. Greenwood pointed out that the best way to accomplish this was to add space in a vertical fashion.

Ms. Greenwald noted that the side that faces Heywood Avenue is two stories with a low sloping roof. A front and rear dormer is proposed to be added to provide the necessary headroom on the new third floor. The master bedroom would be located on the “front” side of the structure and the master bathroom would be located on the “back” side. Ms. Greenwald felt that although this is an upward addition, it would be less intrusive to the neighbors than a first floor, horizontal addition.

Ms. Morelli asked if the clients were aware of the current zoning changes that are being proposed before the Board of Aldermen. Ms. Greenwald indicated that they were aware but that also the proposed amendments had not passed yet. Mr. Sadowski indicated that he felt the Planning Board should put aside what is being proposed as an amendment to the zoning ordinance currently, as it has not been approved yet by the Board of Aldermen. He went on to state that as an advisor to the Board of Appeals, he is viewing this application as one that is asking to create a three story structure. Mr. Sadowski also noted that while the project is proposing dormers, the dormers do not run the full length of the house, which is preferable. He also asked if the structure was in keeping with the neighborhood or if it was dramatically different, but then also indicated that this would be examined in greater detail at the Board of Appeals hearing because the neighbors will provide their input there.

Mr. Sadowski then asked what purpose the window on the rear dormer was serving and Ms. Greenwald indicated that it would let light into the stairwell to the new third floor. Mr. Welch indicated that he had performed a site visit and noted that the structure is somewhat out of the way of Heywood Avenue. He also indicated that he felt the proposed addition would not have a huge impact on the neighbors. Ms. Morelli asked Mr. Welch if he felt the addition would be in scale with the existing structures in the neighborhood. Mr. Welch indicated that most of the buildings in the surrounding area were raised ranch style dwellings, but he felt that this addition would not have a detrimental impact on them.

Mr. Cassidy pointed out that the proposed modifications appeared to be in the spirit of what the Planning Board is proposing to be allowed as a result of the amendments before the Board of Aldermen. He went on to indicate that he would prefer to recommend approval for this project in the letter to the Board of Appeals as opposed to remaining neutral or being in opposition. Ms. Morelli asked the Planning Board if their recommendation letter to the Board of Appeals should explicitly state that the project demonstrates the proposed half story language that is currently before the Board of Aldermen. Ms. DeSouza-Ward indicated that she felt the Planning Board should write a positive recommendation letter to the Board of Appeals. Mr. King indicated that he agreed with Ms. DeSouza-Ward and felt the Planning Board should write a positive letter. Mr. Cassidy stated that he was also in favor of a positive recommendation letter.

Mr. Sadowski stated that if the Planning Board did make reference to the proposed amendment in their recommendation letter, he would prefer to also indicate that the amendment is still pending before the Board of Aldermen. He went on to indicate that he had no objection to the proposed project.

Mr. Cassidy then MADE a MOTION and dictated language for a positive recommendation letter to send to the Board of Appeals which indicated that the Planning Board was pleased to recommend approval of the requested Variance for a habitable third story on the structure. Mr. Cassavoy SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Ms. Morelli then asked if the Applicants had spoken to their neighbors and Ms. Bonneau indicated that she had and all of their comments were positive. Ms. Morelli then indicated that it would be a good idea to get the neighbors to submit letters of support to the Board of Appeals to help strengthen the application.

Document: ZBA Application Case # 13-016

Case # 13-017, 20 Meridian Street, Ronald and Suzanne Roberts

The Applicants, Ronald and Suzanne Roberts, were in attendance along with their contractor, William Penny of Andover Renovation Solutions, Inc. Mr. Penny stated that the proposed addition would extend the north wall of the existing building deeper into the lot. The addition would be essentially three stories in height with a garage on the first level, a family room area on the second level, and the master bedroom on the third level. The addition was designed in a manner to have the least amount of impact on the neighbors as possible. Mr. Penny indicated that the Applicants are requesting zoning relief from lot size, lot frontage, and the 10 foot side yard setback requirement for a principal structure in the UR-A district. The height of the existing structure is not being increased as the proposed addition would simply come off of the existing roofline. Mr. Penny also stated that they had spoken to the abutter to the north and she is supportive of the proposed project.

Ms. Morelli noted that constructing a three story addition here would not be unprecedented for the neighborhood as this type of addition is common practice in this area of the city. Mr. Cassidy confirmed that there would be a garage on the lowest level of the addition and that it would be accessed from the south. Mr. Penny indicated that was correct and Ms. Roberts added that they have a shared driveway with the neighbor to the south. Ms. Roberts also noted that where the proposed addition would be located is currently a parking pad. Ms. Morelli asked as to why there are no windows proposed for the upper level of the right elevation. Mr. Penny responded by saying that in order to keep the proposed roof line at the same level as the existing roof line, this left very little space for functional windows. Additionally, this area will have a closet and a bathroom on the interior and having windows in these areas would not really be appropriate. Mr. Mercado noted that the plans indicate a space for a future deck. Mr. Penny explained that the deck is not being proposed as part of this addition due to the budget for the project, but eventually a deck will be constructed in that particular area. Ms. Morelli inquired if the future deck would have setback implications but Mr. Penny indicated that they would be able to comply with the required setbacks.

Mr. Cassavoy stated that he felt this project was fairly straight forward and recommended a standard letter be sent to the Board of Appeals. Mr. Mercado agreed with Mr. Cassavoy. Mr. Sadowski noted that the proximity of the addition to the north property line was about 8.5 feet and this seemed like enough space as the Planning Board had seen proposals for additions with much less setback. In those other cases the ability to erect a ladder to maintain the proposed addition was of concern, but that is not the case with this application. Mr. King pointed out that the neighbor's driveway to the north is along the side of the property where the addition is and there is also a retaining wall there. These items should provide enough

of a setback from the neighbor's structure to not greatly impact them. Additionally, Mr. King noted that he saw very similar style additions in the neighborhood as the one that is being proposed. Mr. Mercado asked how much the elevation changed from the front of the property to where the parking pad is currently located and Mr. Penny stated that it is about a full story of grade change.

Mr. Cassavoy then MADE a MOTION to send a standard letter to the Board of Appeals. Mr. Mercado SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Ms. Morelli indicated to the Applicants that if they had documentation of neighbor support that they should bring that to the Board of Appeals hearing in August.

Document: ZBA Application Case # 13-017

Mr. Cassavoy then MADE a MOTION to take the 160 Green Street case (Case # 12-004) out of order on the agenda and have the Board discuss that item next. Ms. DeSouza-Ward SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

SITE PLAN REVIEW & AFFORDABLE HOUSING SPECIAL PERMIT

Case # 12-004, 160 Green Street, Eric Kenworthy

The Applicant, Eric Kenworthy, was in attendance to request a continuation of the hearing to the Planning Board's next regularly scheduled meeting on Monday, August 26, 2013. Ms. Morelli pointed out that at the last Planning Board meeting Mr. Kenworthy stated that he would bring his entire project team and new full sets of plans. Ms. Morelli asked the Applicant if he thought he could have these materials ready one week in advance of the August meeting. Mr. Kenworthy indicated that he would have the new materials ready one week in advance. Mr. Cassavoy asked how many members of the Planning Board were still eligible to vote on this particular matter. Mr. Duchesneau stated that all members of the Board, with the exception of Ms. Petrillo, were still eligible to vote on the case. Mr. Cassavoy then pointed out that some of the members may not be able to make the September meeting so it is important to have a very productive meeting on this case in August. Mr. Kenworthy then stated that he would prefer to not have to go to a September meeting if possible. Ms. Gaffey indicated that Planning Staff would need the updated materials by Monday, August 19, 2013.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward then MADE a MOTION to continue the 160 Green Street (Case # 12-004) hearing to the Planning Board's meeting on Monday, August 26, 2013. Mr. Cassavoy SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed and Ms. Petrillo abstained from the vote.

Case # 13-003, 2 Washington Street, WP East Development Enterprises

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., Michael Malynowski from Allen & Major Associates, Inc., Matt Kealey from Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc., and Nelson Hammer from Hammer & Walsh Design. Ms. Zern began by saying how excited WP East Development Enterprises is to be working in Melrose and she reiterated how their firm is committed to contextual design as well as mixed use and mixed income projects.

Mr. Del Savio then gave an overview of the entire project. He pointed out the site's boundaries, the setbacks of the building, and noted the grade change at the rear of the property. He covered the components of the structure itself which would include 94 dwelling units (49 one-bedrooms, 44 two-bedrooms, and 1 studio unit), approximately 2,200 square feet of retail space, and amenities similar to those in the Alta Stone Place development. Mr. Del Savio also discussed the height of the building, the elevation change across the site, and the proposed parking layout. The materials of the proposed building

would include red brick and precast concrete at the base with corrugated metal siding above the first floor. Additionally, the sections of the building that will be used to screen the parking under the building will have vines growing on them.

Mr. Hammer then described the proposed landscaping at the site, noting that they had observed the zoning requirements of the district in regards to screening. The sides of the property would have taller vegetation and fencing, while the grade change at the rear of the property helps maintain the existing screening. Mr. Hammer noted that the proposed street trees would grow upward but not extremely outward and that the predominate tree that would be used on the property would be Red Oak. He also pointed out that they are not proposing a vegetative hedge the front of the property so as to not create a barrier along Washington Street. Mr. Del Savio added that that dumpster enclosure would be located in the northwest corner of the property.

Mr. Malynowski briefly discussed the parking situation, which included retail and visitor parking located at the front of the site. He described the retaining wall at the rear of the site, the piped detention system, and how an infiltration system will take all of the roof water and discharge it into the drainage system in the courtyard. Catch basins and a hydrodynamic separator would be used as treatment devices. Mr. Malynowski went on to note how the water, sewer, gas, and electrical utilities would all access the site in the southeast corner off of Washington Street.

Mr. Kealey then gave a brief overview of the Traffic Impact and Access Study which looked at future conditions and the migration of potential impacts. Various intersections were looked at and most of them would be able to maintain the same level of service. Future potential conditions five years out were examined under a full project build out and without the project being built. The Standard Trip Generation Manual was used to project traffic counts for the various uses in the project. Mr. Kealey noted that the migration impacts of the study focused on how to reduce traffic going to and from the site. Mr. Cassidy inquired what the bottom line of the study was under the full build out and no build out scenarios. Mr. Kealey noted that there would be no reductions in service levels for intersections in the surrounding area with the exception of one, which would drop down slightly in service level status as a result of the proposed project being built. Mr. Cassidy noted that only looking at four intersections in the surrounding area was not a huge sample size and suggested it might be a good idea to look at other intersections slightly further from the project area. Specifically he referenced the intersection at Pleasant Street and West Wyoming Avenue as well as the intersection of Washington Street and Fellsway East.

Mr. Mercado then MADE a MOTION to open the public comment period. Mr. Welch SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed. Ms. Morelli then stated that members of the public would now be permitted to comment on the project and she asked that each speaker introduce themselves and not be repetitive with their comments.

Alderman Gail Infurna began the public comment period by noting that the neighborhood meeting that was held before the application was submitted to the Planning Office was well attended. Alderman Infurna then noted that there are flooding concerns in this area of the City, especially at the bottom of Brazil Street. She hoped that the project engineers would work with the Public Works Department to resolve these issues. She also mentioned that traffic is an issue that always comes up when you increase residential density in an area, but since the Oak Grove project has been completed she has not noticed a substantial increase in traffic on Main Street, which is encouraging. Alderman Infurna then noted that she supported Mr. Cassidy's suggestion of looking at other intersection in the surrounding area and what impact this project would have on them. She felt that a significant amount of people that would live in this project would use the Oak Grove MBTA Station. She also noted that some residents did have concerns about the height of the building, but that the area had undergone a rezoning back in 2008 and the

neighbors were on board with the proposed zoning at that time. This proposed project meets those height limitation requirements.

Alderman Infurna then commented about the condensers on the roof and questioned the amount of impact they would have on the neighbors on Brazil Street, which she felt would be quite significant. She asked that some type of buffering or acoustic sound barrier be installed to reduce the noise of these devices. Alderman Infurna also commented that she would prefer to see more brickwork in the project to help it relate to the other structures across Washington Street. She closed by saying that she felt the project would be a real asset to the neighborhood and that she was looking forward to working with the developer to make this a good project.

Debbie Mathison, of 39 Glen Rock Avenue in Malden, had concerns about the impact the project would have on Patchell Park in Malden, just southwest of the proposed development site. She also expressed concerns about the large existing trees on the property and would like to see them preserved if possible. The trees in the area help to buffer Patchell Park and the surrounding residences from noise and excessive lighting from the other uses in the area. Ms. Mathison also expressed concerns that the proposed lighting on the back side of the parking lot would substantially illuminate her backyard. She also inquired as to how many cars the developers were anticipating to have on site per unit. Mr. Kealey responded by saying that there are 132 parking spaces proposed for the site but the number of cars that will actually park at the property is somewhat unknown. Mr. Kealey then added that they are anticipating there will be 98 new total trips in the morning and 67 new total trips in the evening, to and from the site, as a result of the development.

Steven Ciulla of 52-54 Brazil Street in Melrose raised concerns about the noise that the 94 condenser units would produce on top of the building. He also expressed concerns about how the project would alter the views from his property and stated that he felt the Oak Grove neighborhood was very dense already. Mr. Ciulla stated that he felt a project of this size would only add to an already highly congested area. He also noted that while the building itself would be pushed towards the front of the property, the trash enclosure is proposed to almost be in his backyard. Mr. Ciulla was also looking for more information about the illumination of the project.

Bill D'Amore of Wakefield, representing his mother-in-law at 19 Brazil Street, cited concerns about drainage for the project. He questioned where the stormwater would travel and noted that this area already has flooding issues. Mr. D'Amore also raised concerns about the noise of the condenser units on the roof of the building and asked where the condenser for the retail space would be located. He went on to voice concerns about the lighting for the project and stated that when the adjacent Registry Building was occupied, although small, it had substantial brightness issues for the neighbors. Mr. D'Amore went on to note that he felt the project was too tall as it would be about two stories above Brazil Street. He also asked if there were any environmental contamination issues at the site as he saw two monitoring wells were shown on the existing site plan. Mr. D'Amore also inquired as to how large the transformer for the project was going to be because these devices can also add substantial noise to a project he noted.

Mr. Ciulla spoke again citing short term concerns about the impact construction would have on the neighborhood including noise. He also noted that the City of Melrose used to store snow on this site and wondered what would happen to City snow storage in the future. Ms. Mathison then added that the Glen Rock Avenue/Patchell Park area has water drainage issues as well and noted her concerns about this current issue being worsened. Alderman Infurna requested that a peer review of the traffic report be undertaken. Ms. Morelli noted that the Planning Board is going to request a peer review be completed for not only the traffic study but also for the drainage report.

Valerie Austras of 70 Brazil Street in Melrose stated that she agreed with all of the neighbors' concerns. She too was concerned about the trash enclosure location, the noise of the condensers, and she felt that the building was too tall, noting that no other buildings in this area are five stories in height. Mr. Ciulla added that the Brazil Street residents would be the ones most impacted by this development. Ms. Mathison requested that a site walk be held for the property. Mr. D'Amore asked about snow removal and noted that its removal and/or storage would have a big impact on the drainage at the property. Mr. Cassavoy then MADE a MOTION to keep the public hearing open, but to return to a discussion involving only the members of the Planning Board at the meeting.

Mr. Cassavoy noted that one of the neighbors mentioned how the location of the trash enclosure is not ideal and in thinking along those lines, the time of the trash removal pickups also needs to be coordinated carefully. Mr. Cassavoy also stated that the slope at the rear of the property is a concern to him and he was hoping for more of a buffer at the rear of the site for the neighbors. Mr. Del Savio responded by stating that there is a railroad tie retaining wall at the rear of the property currently. The project would put a Redi Rock retaining wall in front of this wall. Mr. Cassavoy then asked if the Applicant was planning on planting more trees at the rear of the property. Mr. Del Savio indicated that the neighbors' backyards are pretty heavily vegetated currently and therefore they were not planning on many additional plantings. Mr. Malynowski indicated that the new Redi Rock retaining wall would be approximately 6 to 8 feet high and would be placed in front of the existing railroad tie retaining wall.

Mr. Cassavoy stated that he felt the condensing units on the roof of the building would need some screening or sound proofing and he also indicated he wanted to see a sound study from an acoustic engineer. He also asked the Applicant to please look into running the electrical wires underground as having less utility poles in the area is preferable. Mr. Malynowski stated that there is not a lot of clearance underground due to the MWRA line under Washington Street and the power company may not permit the power lines to be placed underground. Mr. Cassavoy next stated that he liked the idea of adding more brick to the building because there is so much brickwork in the area already. Mr. Mercado noted that Malden is building approximately 900 apartments city wide, Alta Stone Place will add almost 300 units when completed, and he therefore asked the Applicant if they thought this 94 unit project would have a good market. Ms. Zern indicated that they thought there was a good market for these units due to the proximity of the site to the Oak Grove MBTA Station and to downtown Melrose. She went on to add that WP East Development Enterprises wants to see a fully leased project just as much as the Planning Board does.

Mr. Mercado asked if the site had any contamination issues and Ms. Zern responded that Phase I and Phase II Environmental Analyses had been completed for the site. Mr. Mercado then asked if the Planning Board could see the environmental or chemical analyses that were completed. Ms. Zern indicated the Applicant could provide those to the Board and also noted that there is some "dirty" fill at the site that will need to be replaced with "clean" fill. Ms. Morelli asked Ms. Zern to please clarify for the record what Phase I and Phase II Environmental Analyses actually mean. Ms. Zern indicated that a Phase I Environmental Analysis is an environmental site assessment which looks at the history of the property. A Phase II Environmental Analysis is a more detailed assessment of the property which provides steps for remediation at the site.

Mr. Cassidy clarified that the existing retaining wall at the rear of the property consists of timber. Mr. Del Savio indicated that correct and went on to note that most of the wall is on the 2 Washington Street site, except for the top two courses of the wall which are actually on the neighbor's property. Mr. Cassidy then turned his comments towards the actual design of the building. He indicated that he thought more could be done with the overhang of the building and also felt that more brickwork is warranted in the design. He confirmed that the building would be constructed on a concrete podium with brickwork up to the first

floor and then framework above that. Mr. Del Savio indicated that was correct. Mr. Cassidy indicated that bringing more brickwork up from the ground level and having less rigid towers would be preferable. The community would like to see more brickwork in the design as well he noted. He went on to state that due to the number of rooftop elements, some type of physical screening with acoustic absorption is warranted. Mr. Del Savio indicated that they did look into putting acoustical walls around the condensers but they had limited options without the screening getting too cumbersome. Mr. Welch suggested that the Applicant use High Seer condensing units which would help to cut down on the amount of noise they would produce. Ms. Zern noted that the building would definitely be Energy Star Efficient as much as possible.

Ms. Morelli urged the project team to look at using the gray water from the project to water the landscaping and plantings at the site. Ms. Zern indicated they would look into this. Mr. Sadowski asked if there was an acoustical consultant on the project team and Mr. Del Savio indicated that they normally retain one, but had not to this point with this project. Mr. Mercado confirmed where the utility hookups would access the property and Mr. Del Savio indicated this would occur in the southeast corner of the site. Mr. Mercado then inquired about the style of light fixtures along Washington Street and Mr. Del Savio indicated that they would be the same poles and fixtures as those in front of the Alta Stone Place development. The fixtures on the poles would be a cut-off style and there would also be bollard light fixtures in the courtyard Mr. Del Savio indicated. Mr. Cassidy noted that the Board has had issues recently with light spilling onto adjacent properties and so the Board wants to ensure that the cut-off for lighting is actually at the property line. Mr. Del Savio indicated that they would be using a 180 degree circular rim that shields light downward. This same cut-off fixture is also being used at the Alta Stone Place development.

Mr. Cassavoy inquired if a site visit should be scheduled and Ms. Morelli indicated that she thought a site visit should be scheduled before the meeting ends. Ms. Morelli then asked the project team to breakdown the parking space figures. Ms. Zern indicated that the project contains 132 total parking spaces. Ten of those spaces are for visitors and 7 are for the retail component, which leaves 115 parking spaces to be spread amongst the 94 residential units. Ms. Morelli then asked the Applicant what the plan was for the snow removal process. Mr. Malynowski indicated that snow storage would occur at the perimeter and the extreme rear of the property in the southwest corner. Ms. Morelli then asked if there would be on-site property management and if those people would be provided with snow removal equipment. Ms. Zern responded by saying that there would be on-site property management, but she was not certain who would actually be conducting the snow removal (a private company or the property management). Mr. Mercado asked if the snow storage would take up some of the parking spaces at the site and Mr. Malynowski indicated that hopefully this would not be the case.

Ms. Morelli asked how trash removal would be handled and Mr. Del Savio indicated that residents would carry their own trash out to the trash enclosure and then the dumpster would be emptied by a private company. There will be a six foot fence around the trash area and there will also be a compactor unit within the enclosure. Ms. Morelli asked if there was an impervious surface calculation provided for on the plans somewhere and Mr. Malynowski indicated that there was not, but that they could provide this information to the Board. Mr. Mercado asked if there was any pervious material at the site outside of the landscaping. Mr. Malynowski indicated that the rear row of parking spaces at the site consisted of pervious pavers. Mr. Mercado then asked why this was not carried throughout the entire site to which Mr. Malynowski responded by saying it was because of the added cost and because of the fact that additional drainage measures would need to be implemented to handle the additional water infiltration. Ms. Morelli asked about the two items in the Building Commissioner's Denial Letter that the project was not in compliance with and Ms. Zern indicated that the plans had been revised to comply with the particular items in question.

Mr. Mercado asked about the depth of the pavement and the material of the curbing for the project. Mr. Malynowski indicated that the pavement was approximately 3 inches thick and the curbing on-site would consist of a precast concrete, but the curbing would be granite as it transitioned from Washington Street. Ms. Morelli asked for clarification as to the intersections that the Board was seeking further information on and they were confirmed to be the intersection at Pleasant Street and West Wyoming Avenue and the intersection of Washington Street and Fellsway East. Ms. Gaffey pointed out that the Board could also request that a peer review consultant weigh in on the traffic study as well. Mr. King indicated that he did not see a real need to do a review of the additional intersections based upon a cursory review of the numbers provided by the project team. Ms. Morelli thought that it would be better to have a peer reviewer comment on this topic. Mr. King noted that the numbers seemed to show that there would be more vehicles entering the site in the morning, but he assumed that this was due to the retail component at the site. Ms. Morelli inquired if the Applicants were hoping to attract a Dunkin Donuts for the project's retail area because they would have a much larger traffic impact than most coffee shops. Mr. Kealey indicated that the figures were based off a neighborhood coffee shop locating in the retail space as this is the anticipated type of tenant.

Mr. Sadowski noted that the Oak Grove development had a maximum square footage limitation for retail space in an attempt to help create a more viable mixed use environment there. Ms. Morelli stated that the number of units in the project would indicate the potential for a more vertical mixed use type of environment instead of simply having all of the retail on the first floor of the building. Mr. Mercado asked what the City of Malden has had to say about the project. Ms. Gaffey indicated that she had reached out to the Malden City Planner and she is aware, but she has not provided any comments at this time. The Planning Board then discussed possible times to conduct a site visit and settled on the time of Wednesday, August 28, 2013 at 6:30 PM. The Planning Board then discussed and determined that they wanted to hold a Special Meeting for the project on Monday, September 9, 2013 at 7:45 PM.

Mr. King asked if any percolation tests had been performed at the site. Mr. Malynowski indicated that they are proposing to do test pits prior to construction. Mr. Del Savio asked at what point it would be appropriate to go through the Design Review Subcommittee. Mr. Cassidy indicated that the Design Review Subcommittee has fallen off a little bit because much of their purview is now handled during the Site Plan Review process. However, if there are still outstanding design issues at the end of the Site Plan Review process, those can be addressed through the Design Review Subcommittee after approval of the project.

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, September 9, 2013. Ms. DeSouza-Ward SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

ZONING AMENDMENTS

Draft Report to Board of Aldermen for Proposed Zoning Amendments

Ms. Gaffey provided a recap of the past events regarding the proposed zoning amendments. After the Joint Public Hearing between the Planning Board and the Board of Aldermen that was held on Monday, July 15, 2013, the Planning Board now needs to provide a report back to the Board of Aldermen within 21 days which summarizes the Joint Public Hearing and indicates any changes to the amendments that are recommended by the Planning Board. Ms. Gaffey stated that she did not think these reports needed to be very extensive as there was no public comment at the Joint Public Hearing and very few comments from the Aldermen.

Mr. Cassavoy indicated that there seemed to be some confusion regarding some of the building and zoning terminology. Ms. Gaffey stated that the Planning Board did need to mention in one of the reports how a clerestory would be interpreted. Ms. DeSouza-Ward felt that if the clerestory was no higher than the height limitation in the zoning district, then it should be permitted. She went on to indicate that she would recommend all of the zoning amendments as they are currently being proposed. There was then discussion about two different types of clerestories. One which intersected the roof peak at a very sharp angle and only on one side of the roof, and the other which would be situated on both sides of the roof peak. Ms. DeSouza-Ward indicated that she felt these types of architectural elements would not be impacted by the proposed zoning amendments. Mr. Cassidy agreed and felt that it was unlikely that the Planning Board or the Building Commissioner would come across them. Ms. Gaffey then stated that they would have the reports submitted to the Board of Aldermen by Monday, August 5, 2013.

OTHER

Design Review Subcommittee Report regarding 185 Essex Street

The Design Review Subcommittee provided a report to the rest of the Planning Board regarding the evolving lighting situation for the project at 185 Essex Street. Ms. Gaffey provided a brief summary of the situation and indicated how a recently installed light fixture is negatively impacting the neighbor at 39 Vine Street. She went on to note that the offending light fixture is actually not even indicated on the approved site plan. Mr. Cassidy indicated that he is not thrilled with the light fixture that has been proposed to be installed by the Applicant. Mr. Sadowski pointed out that the zoning ordinance indicates that light shall not spill onto neighboring properties and therefore, even if the light fixture was permitted on the plan, it cannot spill light onto the neighboring property.

Ms. Gaffey noted that the Building Commissioner asked the Applicant to shut off the offending light fixture until a resolution could be reached. Possible solutions the Design Review Subcommittee is considering include shielding the existing light fixture, lowering the height of the pole to which the existing fixture is attached and shielding the fixture, or simply removing the offending light fixture and pole. Ms. Morelli suggested that the lighting in this area could be more pedestrian oriented, which would bring it lower to the ground. Mr. Cassavoy noted that the existing fixture is less than 10 feet from the neighboring building and the fixture that the Applicant is proposing to install seems like it will still be too bright. Ms. DeSouza-Ward asked if the Applicant was going to return before the Design Review Subcommittee. Ms. Gaffey indicated that Planning Staff is coordinating with the Applicant to arrange a site visit at night once the new fixture has been installed. She went on to indicate that once a street tree that is obscuring an existing street light is trimmed and another street light is repaired, there may be adequate lighting at the site. Mr. King asked what the recourse is for those Applicants who are not in compliance with a Planning Board decision. Ms. Gaffey indicated that the City would withhold Certificates of Occupancy, which is what is currently happening in this situation.

Mr. Mercado then shifted topics and asked Planning Staff what was going on with the property at the corner of Main Street and Grove Street. Ms. Gaffey explained that the construction workers at this property damaged the underground culvert below the site and the City is currently in the process of repairing it.

Mr. Cassavoy then MADE a MOTION to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Morelli SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Meeting adjourned at 10:35 PM.