

**MELROSE PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
Regular Meeting and Public Hearing
Monday, May 18, 2015
7:45 PM**

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

PRESENT: Carla Morelli, Michael Cassavoy, Ed Cassidy, Anne DeSouza-Ward, Paul King, Robert Mercado, John Sadowski and Jack Welch. Sharon Petrillo arrived at 8:15.

ABSENT: none

Erin Zwirko, Assistant Planning Director, and Jessica Mitchell, Planning Coordinator, were present.

The meeting was called to order at 7:50 PM by Ms. Morelli.

MINUTES

Special Meeting and Public Hearing, April 13, 2015

Mr. Cassidy made a grammatical correction to the minutes.

Mr. Sadowski MADE a MOTION to accept the minutes of April 13, 2015 as corrected. Mr. Welch SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

BOARD OF APPEALS

Case 15-007, 22 Clinton Road, 22 Clinton Realty Trust (June 10, 2015)

Mr. Joseph Guarino of 22 Clinton Realty Trust presented the application. He said he would like to remove the existing sun-porch and foundation and replace it with a new larger addition and full basement across the back of the dwelling.

Mr. Sadowski asked about the new retaining wall and the stairs to the basement on the right side of the property. He stated that the new stairs would increase the encroachment into the side yard setback. Mr. Guarino replied that the stairs would provide access to the new basement. The stairs will be located below grade and can't be located elsewhere on the property because the rear contains a pool and patio area.

Mr. Cassavoy made a suggestion to relocate the basement access to the location of the stairs that will access the main portion of the addition. Mr. Guarino said that the basement access door is wider and he can't locate it there.

Mr. King said that it is difficult for the Board to see what he is saying because the site plan does not include any of these obstacles that Mr. Guarino is referring to. He can see four or five options to relocate the access to the basement away from the side setback.

Mr. Sadowski said that the purpose of this review was to be helpful to the applicant and that if the applicant were able to change his plans to not encroach any further, then the Planning Board could give a stronger recommendation for his case.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward said that she had no objection to extending the preexisting non conforming condition as long as it did not encroach any further. Mr. Cassavoy agreed.

The Board discussed the below grade stairs and if it would present a safety issue. Mr. Guarino said that the entrance would have a safety railing around it so it would not present a safety hazard.

Mr. Cassidy said that he recommended that the Planning Board should recommend denial as he saw options to move the side stair which is the offending element of the proposal.

Mr. Mercado asked the applicant if he would be willing to relocate the stairs. Mr. Guarino said that he could not move the stairs to the rear as it would be in the area of the pool and fence.

Mr. Sadowski said that he thought this was a very minor issue for the applicant and that the Board had no objections otherwise.

Mr. Cassidy reiterated his suggestion to issue a letter recommending the proposal be denied unless the applicant could suggest an alternative proposal for the side steps.

Mr. Guarino said that he could look at the plans again. Mr. Sadowski asked the applicant if he would commit to moving the stairs in a new plan.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward suggested the letter could read that the Planning Board doesn't object to maintaining the setback of 6.2-FT, but that there should be no further encroachment.

Mr. Guarino expressed concern regarding the use of the word denial.

Ms. Morelli replied that the Planning Board would not recommend a more non conforming condition and that he would have a difficult time receiving a variance when the stairs could easily be relocated to the back. They would state that they would not recommend that the existing non conforming setback be exacerbated by further encroachment of the side stairs. She said that unless he wanted to redesign this element and return to the Planning Board that would be what the letter would say. Mr. Sadowski, Mr. Cassidy and Ms. DeSouza-Ward all agreed.

Ms. Sadowski MADE a MOTION to send a letter with the above comments to the Board of Appeals. Ms. DeSouza-Ward SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed. Ms. Petrillo did not vote as she had not arrived at the meeting yet.

Document: ZBA Application Case 15-007

Case 15-008, 41 Fairfield Ave, Steven and Maureen Pelletier (June 10, 2015)

Michael Satterwhite, Esq. presented the application for the applicants Maureen and Steven Pelletier. The Pelletiers purchased the property 2 years ago. The property contains a single family home on a double lot. They wish to remove the existing single family dwelling and replace it with a duplex. This requires a Variance and a Special Permit from the ZBA. The combined lot is 10,896-SF. The UR-B requires 10,500-SF for a two family use.

Ms. Morelli asked if this was in a UR-B as she thought it was in a UR-A zone. Mr. Satterwhite replied that she was correct. It is inside a UR-A zone. However, in his opinion, it is somewhat near the border to the UR-B zone.

Mr. Cassavoy said that a UR-A zone requires 13,500-SF for a two family structure.

Ms. Pelletier added that the existing house is non-conforming and only 9-FT from the lot. The new two family duplex will be more conforming and be set back 10-FT on both sides.

Mr. King asked about the Special Permit for two family use and if any other two family structures were in the neighborhood. Ms. Pelletier said that the house directly next door was a two family and there were others as well.

Mr. Cassavoy asked how high the ledge on the property is. Ms. Pelletier replied that there have been some flooding problems with the ledge behind them, but that the previous owners filled the lot and they have not had problems.

Mr. Cassavoy asked if they planned to locate the garages below grade. Ms. Pelletier said that the garages would be at grade level, which is higher than the street level. She then added that the lot is a double lot that the city recently decided should be a single lot.

Mr. Cassavoy explained that adjacent lots that are held in common ownership are considered to be merged for zoning purposes. He asked if they planned to hire a contractor and if they had spoken to the abutters. Ms. Pelletier replied that they did plan to hire a contractor and that she has spoken to the closest neighbors and no one has verbalized a problem.

Mr. Cassavoy said that the neighborhood contained mostly smaller single family houses. He is concerned that one 80-FT long building would not fit in. He asked if the applicant had considered placing the two halves of the duplex at different elevations so that they would appear to be two separate buildings. He thought the sloped topography of the lot would help facilitate this.

Ms. Pelletier said that the lot was not steeply sloped and it would only require a few more steps if both halves were at the same elevation. She said that they were trying to accomplish the goal of visually appearing as two houses that were similarly sized to the other houses in the neighborhood. She restated that they had more land than their neighbors.

Mr. Pelletier said that they were also trying to capture the view which is at the rear of the property. He thought a staggered elevation might improve this.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward asked what the minimum lot size for a single family was in the UR-A zone. Ms. Zwirko replied that it was 7,500-SF for a single family. Ms. DeSouza-Ward said that it is not truly a double lot. It is a large single family lot. She said she would not support a Special Permit for a two family use in a UR-A zone on an undersized lot. She thought this was a single family neighborhood and it is not zoned for proposals such as this one.

Mr. Mercado said he thought that the proposed two family dwelling was out of character with the neighborhood. There is nothing anywhere near that size. He was concerned this proposal would impact the character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Cassidy said he thought a change in floor elevations; specifically dropping the lower unit would help the dwellings appear more like townhouses. He also thought that the driveways would work better with a change in elevation as he is concerned the west side driveway would be steeply sloped. He said he might not have a problem with the size if the units looked distinctly separate. He was also concerned about the amount of paving in the front yard because it does not feel residential. It looks too commercial. He wondered if they could have one driveway entering the property and entering garages from behind instead.

Mr. Mercado asked if the applicant would be willing to redesign.

Ms. Pelletier said that the street is below the property. Mr. Pelletier added that he thought they could look at dropping the west building. They did not think they could redesign the driveways because the lot drops off substantially in the rear of the property.

Ms. Morelli said that she thought that this would further distinguish the two dwellings and help breakdown the mass. She said it would be helpful to communicate with there neighbors as well.

Ms. Pelletier said that there is currently a very large maple tree in front of the house, approximately 35-FT wide which would cover a good portion of the eastern house from the street view. She said they would also plant additional trees in the front. She also presented a sheet with a drawing of the house and description of their project that she distributed to the neighbors.

Mr. Cassidy asked about the difference in the choice of garage doors in the two units. He thought the carriage doors looked better. Ms. Pelletier responded that they would be willing to change that. She was just trying to make them look different.

Mr. King asked if they thought they could turn the building 90 degrees on the lot therefore locating the shorter side of the building in the front.

Ms. Pelletier said that the steeper part of their lot was in the rear and she also did not want to move the driveway to be too close to the neighbor. She thought the front of the proposed structure was more attractive from the front as they had proposed farmer's porches in the front.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward said that although it was nice to discuss a design that would fit into the neighborhood better, she could not support a proposal that did not meet the requirements. She does not see enough reasons to support a variance and thinks that is the first hurdle to pass before they can talk about the request for special permit or the design. Mr. Welch agreed. He did not think this was a two family neighborhood.

Ms. Petrillo asked if she was allowed to vote on this matter as she had arrived late. Ms. Morelli said she would not be allowed to vote if she had not been present for the entire presentation, but that she was free to ask questions and participate in the discussion.

The Board discussed the question if redesigning the dwelling would make it a more acceptable proposal.

Mr. Sadowski said that there are not many two families in close proximity. Mr. Satterwhite said he looked for examples within a 4-5 mile radius. Mr. Sadowski said that was a very large range given the overall size of Melrose and the examples that he had presented weren't really what he considered to be in the same neighborhood. He would be interested to know how many existed within a 1-2 block radius.

Ms. Pelletier said that the house directly abutting them was a two family and that among the 32 abutters, she thought there were six or more two family structures and even more properties were potential two family structures.

Ms. Morelli said that finding units that are legal two families and those that look like two families is very different. The proposal is for two full size units, side by side, each of which are larger than the existing house. She said that the Applicants have heard the comments from the Board and can see that the letter will not be a positive letter. The Applicants can choose to redesign the structure and return to the Board for further discussion and potentially a positive recommendation.

Mr. Pelletier asked what the next step would be.

Ms. Zwirko said that they could return to the Planning Board on June 22 for further discussion, but that would require asking the Board of Appeals for a continuance. Otherwise, the Planning Board would prepare a letter to submit to the Board of Appeals that would detail the concerns of the Planning Board as discussed.

Mr. Mercado said that they can still go forward to the ZBA if they choose. Ms. Morelli said that they would have to write the letter based on tonight's comments if they chose to go forward.

Ms. Morelli summarized the letter that would be sent. She said it would say the Planning Board generally objected to the two family and had aesthetic concerns related to the volume and structure.

Mr. Cassidy gave an oral draft of a proposed letter. Some of his points included that the Board was split on opinion on whether the lot area in this case is a fatal flaw, but others were less concerned with that, but believe the design proposed is oversized for the neighborhood. The architecture does not replicate the single family homes that predominate in the neighborhood. Some members suggested a modest redesign including lowering the westerly unit which would also limit the slope of the driveway.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward proposed revising the text to say "could not support building a two family on an undersized lot" rather than "fatal flaw."

Ms. Cassidy MADE a MOTION to send a letter to the Board of Appeals as discussed. Mr. Cassavoy SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed. Ms. Petrillo abstained.

Ms. Morelli told the applicant that if they chose, they could revise their design and return to the Planning Board for further review. They would need to contact the Board of Appeals to ask for a continuance.

Document: ZBA Application Case 15-008

Case 15-009, 20 Youle Street, Joanne Morris (June 10, 2015)

Joanne Morris represented her application. She also brought her contractor, Jane Face from Blackdog Builders, to answer any questions. She said that the house is currently a two family. She is proposing to expand the second floor over the existing footprint of the first floor. She is proposing to add two bedrooms and a bathroom to make room for children in the second floor unit. The house's appearance from the front would remain the same.

Mr. Sadowski asked if the house would further encroach into the side setback because the house was not parallel to the lot line. He was concerned about the side setback, which is less than 2-FT at the closest point, and the impact on necessary regular maintenance of the structure.

Ms. Morris replied that the house at that location is currently one and a half stories. She was proposing to increase the height of this portion of the house, but it would not be any closer to the side than it already is today.

Mr. Cassavoy said that the houses are very close together in the area that she lives. He proposed a shed roof might help reduce the height of the overall structure. He said the maintenance would not be an issue as State law requires that you allow your neighbor access to your property to maintain their own. However, she would need to get her neighbor's permission to access the property to build.

Ms. Morris represented that her neighbors support her proposal.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward said that although the first floor is very close to the lot line, since the applicant is only proposing to increase the height and is not increasing the encroachment, she has no issue with it. She would support a neutral letter. Mr. Cassavoy agreed.

Mr. Sadowski asked about the fence that is already on the lot line. Mr. Cassavoy said that she would have to build staging above the fence.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward MADE a MOTION to send a letter that details the Planning Board's concerns about maintenance but has no other objections to the Board of Appeals. Mr. Mercado SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Document: ZBA Application Case 15-009

Case 15-010, 407-413 Pleasant Street, 407-413 Pleasant Street LLC (June 10, 2015)

Ms. Judith Clark, Esq. presented the application on behalf of the applicant Mr. Mathew Roman, manager for 407-413 Pleasant St., LLC. The building is currently a two story structure that contains four units. Mr. Roman would like to add a third story and increase the number of units to six. The proposal requires variances for density, setbacks, and parking. Some of the Variances are pre-existing conditions. An application has been filed with the ZBA and the proposed project will also require Site Plan Review and an Affordable Housing Special Permit. If the variances are granted, more detailed plans would be submitted with a Site Plan Review Application and an Affordable Housing Special Permit Application. However, if the ZBA does not grant the variances; Mr. Roman will renovate the property as a 4-unit dwelling and there would not be an Affordable Housing component.

The current structure is in disrepair. It has been rental property for a long time and not properly maintained. Mr. Roman would like to improve the appearance of the building. Adding an additional story to the building will increase the height, however it will still be shorter than Webster Willows, a large multifamily building, which is directly next door.

Mr. Roman said that the building has a good structure, but that it is currently vinyl and aluminum sided that has no detailing. It also has a dirt parking lot without any landscape or hardscape. He would like to add some brackets and other details to improve the facade of the building. He thinks he could get similar results to the recent renovation of the building at the corner of Main Street and Essex Street.

Mr. Cassavoy said that he would applaud an upgrade to the exterior appearance of the building because it clearly needs work. He is concerned about the parking issues.

Mr. Roman said that he plans to have six parking spaces, which would provide one parking spot per unit. He thinks this will be sufficient given the transit orientated location of the building. He said that if he didn't think the units would be marketable with only one parking place, then he would not pursue this because it would ultimately be the developer's problem.

Mr. Cassavoy asked if he had gotten any advice from the Building Inspector. Mr. Roman replied that he had been told to speak with the Planning Board.

Mr. Cassavoy was concerned about the balloon framing of the building and if it would support an additional story. Mr. Roman said that he has had experience with this type of construction before and he has also had a structural engineer review the project.

Mr. Cassavoy expressed concern with the minimum lot area and that this lot is quite a bit under what is required in the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Mercado asked about where visitors would park if only 6 spaces were provided. Mr. Roman replied that the Melrose regulations of no on street parking are very clear. The owners of the individual units would need to make arrangements for that. Mr. Roman investigated leasing spaces at Webster Willows, but found that the parking spaces are all deeded individually, requiring arrangements to be made with individual tenants rather than the condominium association.

Ms. Petrillo asked if Webster Willows restricted sub letting parking spaces. Mr. Roman replied they do not.

Mr. Welch asked if the units would be condominiums or rental units. Mr. Roman replied they would be condominiums.

Mr. Sadowski asked about the current layout and number of parking spaces. Mr. Roman said that he would need to reconfigure the spaces to be front load spaces and a 6-FT back up area.

Mr. Sadowski expressed concern about the distance between the new proposed deck and the space the cars would have to back up to exit the lot. He asked if the deck was required. Mr. Roman said that the deck was required for egress purposes.

Mr. Sadowski asked about the Right-of-Way on the property. Mr. Roman replied that the easement had been abandoned and has not been used in 40 years. He was currently in discussions with the owners of Webster Willows to formally dissolve this easement.

Ms. Petrillo cautioned that non use doesn't abandon easement rights. Ms. Clark said that the easement is owned by Mr. Roman's property and existed for the benefit of a property that existed in the rear of the Webster Willows building for driveway purposes. As this property is now parking for Webster Willows, it is no longer needed.

Mr. King asked about the width of the parking area. He said that he visited the property and found that he could pull into a parking spot and back out again. However, there is no deck now. Mr. Roman replied that there was about 40-FT and although this is a minimum amount, it does provide maneuvering space.

Mr. King was concerned about how the posts that supported the deck would be protected from being hit by a car that was trying to back out.

Ms. Morelli asked about the depth of the porch and stairs. Mr. Roman said that it would protrude 4-FT out at the ground level. The upper sections would protrude 8-FT, but that the upper floors would be cantilevered out on supports that would tie back into the lower portion of the deck. He said that he has revised the design since he submitted the drawings that were provided to the Planning Board by the Board of Appeals.

Ms. Morelli asked about the size of the parking spaces and the overall layout of the parking spaces. She is concerned that the reduced size of the spaces along with the reduced maneuvering aisle to back out and the presence of the support columns for the deck would make a very difficult parking lot.

The Board discussed the dimensions of each of the parking spaces and the construction of the deck with Mr. Roman so that they could get a better understanding of what was being proposed. The also discussed other parking options in the area that parking spaces could be rented from.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward said that there is a lot of evidence that says one space per unit is adequate in a transit orientated area and in addition, a permit for overnight residential parking can be purchased to park in a nearby municipal lot. Her greatest concern is the layout of the proposed lot.

Mr. Roman said that since these units will be condominium units, then the purchasers can decide if the parking meets the requirements for them. He thinks this would not be an appropriate unit for someone that drives an oversized vehicle and that therefore, that person would not purchase the property.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward asked about providing an affordable housing unit. Ms. Clark said that they were aware that they would need to address that component if they increased the unit count to six.

Mr. Welch asked if the building would contain an elevator. Mr. Roman replied no.

Mr. King said that he thought providing 1.5 spaces per unit would be more comfortable. He is concerned that the current parking layout would require backing out onto Pleasant Street, which he thought would be problematic.

Mr. Roman said that he could add the extra story and keep the unit count the same. However, this would create larger units, which he thought would change the demographic of the families that would purchase the units. Currently he is proposing 2 bedroom units, which tend to attract couples and one child families that are just starting out. They tend to be a 10-15 year ownership plan for people.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward asked about snow and trash removal. Mr. Roman said that the snow would need to be removed from the premises and would be arranged for within a condominium association. Ms. Clark said trash removal would be self provided as well.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward said she could not support extreme variances on the area dimensions. She has no objection to the multifamily use.

Ms. Morelli said she would like to see an engineered site plan for the parking layout. She is not convinced that the plans presented will work. Mr. Sadowski noted that the surveyor that did the site plan is also a civil engineer. Mr. Roman replied that he thought he could improve the layout of the parking, but that it would always be tight and that he would have to appropriately market the sale of the units to the right buyers.

Mr. King asked if Mr. Roman could pursue an easement from the commercial property next door to allow use of their driveway that abuts his parking area to help with circulation.

Mr. Cassidy suggested he could look into stackable parking units.

Ms. Morelli asked the Planning Board if they could summarize their recommendations. She said she would like to see more detail on the Site Plan. She would like to see elevations that match the design intended and represent what they intend to build.

Mr. Cassidy said that the desire to improve the aesthetics of the building is not apparent from the materials submitted. The location on Pleasant Street supports the multifamily housing so he wasn't as

concerned with the density. However, he'd like to see more complete designs that match the intent of the applicant and a parking layout that is demonstrated to work. Mr. Cassidy suggested that the applicant could return to the Planning Board with revisions prior to the Board of Appeals hearing. The Applicant could also address these concerns during Site Plan review.

Mr. Cassavoy said the lot area is currently non-conforming, but that the current proposal would make it 50% further out of compliance.

Ms. Morelli said that she thinks the design elements could be made to work. However, she's not convinced that the parking layout could be made to work.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward agreed with Mr. Cassavoy and said she could not support many of the variances requested; however, she doesn't object to the concept of the project. It is an urban housing area and the density is acceptable. She thinks less than 2 parking spaces per unit would work, but she would like evidence that the proposed layout would work. Mr. Sadowski agreed.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward MADE a MOTION to send a letter with the above comments to the Board of Appeals. Mr. Mercado SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Document: ZBA Application Case 15-010

SITE PLAN REVIEW

Case 15-002, 37 Washington Street, WP East Acquisitions, LLC (continued public hearing)

Adelaide Grady from Wood Partners was there to address concerns raised at the prior hearing and provide additional materials. She also had some responses to engineering questions and abutter concerns raised.

Brian Jones, the civil engineer for the project said that he has met with the City Engineer to discuss the water line issues. The water line will be configured in a loop from Stone Place to Washington Street and will be incorporated into the existing Phase I stub. The existing sewer line will be rehabilitated and reused. They have to take that approach because of the location of the MWRA water line. They can't create a new sewer connection in this location. A sewer stub will also be created for 99 Washington Street as requested by the abutter. In response to the concerns about the driveway width that were raised by their abutter, they have increased the driveway width from 24-FT to 30-FT. They also changed the shape of the driveway to provide a larger radius for turning trucks as they enter and leave the site.

Mr. Cassidy asked why the driveway was only flared on the left. Mr. Jones replied that the right side of the driveway was apron and there was no need to flair that side. Mr. Jones said they have modeled the truck movements and he showed the Board the diagrams of the results. Mr. Jones explained four movements were modeled, although it was likely that only two of the movements would be used as the driveway is typically only an egress. Ms. Grady said that they also moved an internal sidewalk adjacent to the transformers was eliminated so that the full width of the driveway is 30-FT even with cars parked in spaces next to the driveway on the abutter's property.

Mr. John Tozza of 99 Washington Street asked to speak. He said he had spoken to the Engineer and he was concerned about the curb cuts and shrubs. Mr. Jones said that the curb would not be elevated. Ms. Grady said that they will pave to the edge of the building at 99 Washington St.

Mr. Mercado asked what kind of pavement they would be using. Mr. Jones said they would use 4 inch thick pervious pavement. Mr. Mercado asked if this would support the weight of a truck. Mr. Jones said

pervious pavement gets its strength from the deeper sub base required. He said they would use a deeper base to accommodate the specifications for tractor trailer use. Mr. Jones showed diagrams and explained how the pervious pavement functioned. He said that essentially the pervious material is stronger than asphalt because it is more flexible and that it derives its strength from the depth of the sub base, which will be approximately 23-FT deep.

Ms. Morelli asked if the issue of having to use two different plows had been eliminated. Mr. Jones said that he still recommends a plastic edge blade, but that the pavement will still function if a steel edge blade is used. It would require additional yearly maintenance if the steel edge blade is used.

Mr. Mercado asked if they had drilled any test pits. Mr. Jones said that they had drilled numerous test pits and that the materials on the site were the same as what was found at 2 Washington Street.

Ms. Morelli asked Mr. Jones if there were any other engineering issues. Mr. Jones replied no.

Mr. Rob Del Salvo, the project architect, presented the changes to the buildings proposed. He said there was no change in design since the previous drawings were presented. They have more definitive information on the HVAC design based on actual size of the units. The units will be smaller than what was originally depicted. They will be screened by a wall and will be under the maximum allowed noise allowance of 40 decibels. Ms. Grady added that the screen wall would be solid, which would also screen noise.

Mr. Del Salvo said they have increased the amount of brick used on the buildings facing the courtyard area. He also walked the Board through the drawings pointing out the various aesthetic elements of the buildings.

Mr. Cassidy asked what the average size of the units was. Mr. Del Salvo said they ranged from 820-SF to 1,000-SF.

Mr. Cassidy asked if the buildings were LEED certified. Ms. Grady said that they were not, even though they followed the principals, but that it was a matter of the cost of the process, registration and tracking. They found that the proximity to public transportation and the utility costs were issues of more importance to their renters.

Mr. Cassidy asked about the location of the gas meters. Mr. Del Salvo said that they would be divided into two locations on the railroad side of Building F. On Building E, they would be distributed in blocks of 8 and 6 units on the back of the building. In addition, each building will have one water meter.

Mr. Cassidy asked about the lights. Ms. Grady said that they would be providing shepherd hook style lighting the same as at 2 Washington St on the street side. More utilitarian lighting would be used at the rear of the site.

Mr. Tom Minor, the project landscape architect, reviewed the landscaping plans with the Board. He said that the proposed trees would be Lindens, which are the same as across the street, and would not conflict with the phone lines. They are about 15-FT wide and would help mass the building. They will also be adding more lighting to the entry along the back. They have added some bike racks next to the transformers. They will also plant some low shrubs next to the building to screen the gas meters from view. They have made a minor change to the grass areas along the edge of the parking lot and those areas will now be stone mulch so that the effect of salt and sand from plowing doesn't kill the grass.

Mr. Cassavoy asked the size of the stone mulch proposed. Mr. Minor said he wasn't certain, but very small, about three-fourths to 1-Inch.

Mr. Cassidy asked about the curbing. Mr. Jones replied that it would be a mix of precast concrete and vertical granite.

Mr. Cassidy asked about a dog walking area and more bike racks. Ms. Grady said that these existed at Stone Place and that there was a reciprocal access agreement on amenities. There would also be additional bike racks located inside the garages.

Mr. John Tozza of 99 Washington Street asked to speak. He asked if the shrubs or parking spaces would protrude into the 30-FT wide area of the driveway. Mr. Jones replied that they would not. The reciprocal access agreement did not allow parking within the easement.

Mr. Cassidy asked for a summary on the acoustic screening plan.

Mr. Del Salvo said that they have specified all of the HVAC units now and they meet the ordinance to not exceed 40 decibels even if they did not provide screening. However, they still plan to provide a screening wall.

Mr. Mercado MADE a MOTION to close the public hearing. Mr. Cassavoy SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Ms. Morelli asked the Board to look at the updated staff report and if they had any questions on the conditions.

Ms. Zwirko read the proposed conditions.

The Board asked questions regarding the conditions and proposed some additional language to clarify.

Ms. Zwirko said that in addition to the conditions described, a small area in the southeast corner may need to be blasted. Blasting is highly regulated by the Fire Department; however, Ms. Zwirko asked if the Planning Board would like to add a condition regarding blasting. Ms. Zwirko noted that in the past the Board typically adds a condition if blasting is not the preferred method of rock removal and the applicant should use other methods if possible. The Planning Board determined that a condition would not be required due to the Fire Department's involvement in and oversight of blasting activities.

Mr. Mercado asked if they could remove the rock by mechanical means. Ms. Grady indicated that the anticipated area is very small and the blasting could be completed in 1 day. Mechanically removing the rock would require hammering rock for a week which she thought would be more annoying to the neighborhood.

Mr. Mercado asked if Construction Management plans had been submitted. Ms. Grady said that yes.

Ms. Morelli asked the Board if they were ready to vote on the single waiver requested for sign renderings.

Mr. Cassavoy MADE a MOTION to approve the waiver request. Mr. Welch SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed. Ms. Petrillo abstained as she missed one of the public hearings.

Mr. Cassavoy MADE a MOTION to approve the modification to the Site Plan with the staff report containing the conditions as modified. Mr. Mercado SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed. Ms. Petrillo abstained as she missed one of the public hearings.

Documents: Site Plan Review Case 15-002
 Revised Site Plans, Landscape Plans, and Architectural Plans
 Letter to Denise Gaffey, City Planner, from Brian D. Jones, Allen & Major, dated May 4, 2015
 Letter to Rob Del Savio, Embarc Studio, from Jeffrey L. Fullerton, Acentech, dated April 29, 2015

OTHER

Modification of Case 14-002, Affordable Housing Incentive Program Special Permit, 146-152 Green St.

Ms. Zwirko said that the developer of 146-152 Green Street has decided to sell five of the six units as condominiums and retain the sixth unit as an investment. Rather than a lump sum payment to the Affordable Housing Trust Fund, the developer would contribute 2% of the sales price of each unit when a unit sells. The contribution for the investment unit would be calculated based on 2% of the market value of the unit. The Affordable Housing Special Permit would be modified to strike the existing condition and replaced with two conditions as described by Ms. Zwirko.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward MADE a MOTION to modify the Affordable Housing Incentive Program Special Permit, Case 14-002, 146-152 Green Street. Mr. Cassidy SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Summer Meeting Dates

Ms. Zwirko asked the members if they had any vacation plans that would conflict with the regular summer meeting dates. Many of the Board members were not certain of their vacation plans, or did not have their calendars. Ms. Zwirko said she would send an email out tomorrow and asked the members to respond with their schedules.

NEXT MEETINGS

A Special Meeting and Public Hearing is scheduled for Monday, June 1, 2015

The next Regular Meeting is scheduled for Monday, June 22, 2015

The meeting adjourned at 11:03 PM.