

**MELROSE PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
Regular Meeting and Public Hearing
Monday, October 26, 2015
7:45 PM
Aldermanic Chamber, City Hall, 562 Main Street**

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

ABSENT: None

Denise Gaffey, Director and City Planner, and Erin Zwirko, Assistant Planning Director, were present.

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

MINUTES

Planning Board Regular Special and Public Hearing, September 21, 2015

Ms. DeSouza-Ward MADE a MOTION to accept the Planning Board minutes of September 21, 2015 as written. Mr. Mercado SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

SITE PLAN REVIEW

Case 15-006, 775 Main Street and 8 Porter Street, Hallmark Health Corporation (public hearing)
Case 15-007, 18, 20, and 24 Porter Street, Hallmark Health Corporation (public hearing)

Attorney Patrick McAvoy reintroduced the Applicant and the consultant team to the Planning Board. Attorney McAvoy indicated that the Applicant had prepared responses to the comments received at the first public hearing. Hugh Kelleher, Vice President of Support and Ancillary Services, provided an overview of the responses to comments received at the previous public hearing.

Mr. Kelleher explained that the construction management plan has been revised with respect to construction routes. Construction vehicles would approach the site from either Main Street or Lebanon Street. Leaving the site, vehicles would drive east on Porter Street, turn right onto Rowe Street, and then right again onto East Emerson Street, where the vehicle would depart the area on either Lebanon Street or Main Street. Mr. Kelleher noted that construction workers would park offsite and be shuttled to the construction site. The Applicant will install construction route signs and work with the Police Department.

With regard to snow removal, Mr. Kelleher explained that snow will not be stored onsite. Hallmark Health has purchased broadband sound alarms for their campus vehicles. Mr. Kelleher explained that rather than a beeping alarm, these devices emit a targeted whooshing noise which is OSHA accepted and is required by New York City in noise-sensitive locations.

The Applicant's consultant reviewed the location of the underground storage tank for stormwater. Mr. Kelleher explained that the consultant noted that the elevation of the Upper Porter Street Lot is lower than the adjacent residential properties. Since water tends to flow downhill, the consultant found no reason to relocate the storage tank.

Mr. Kelleher explained that Hallmark Health is still working with Dr. Torraca at 12 Porter Street to resolve his concerns. Mr. Kelleher explained that they have offered to provide 3 parking spaces in the Upper Lot as well as snow removal.

Mr. Kelleher stated that further conversations will occur between the City and the Applicant with regard to the improvements to Porter Street.

The three benches have remained in the plan. Mr. Kelleher indicated that trash barrels have been added to the plan and that Hallmark Health is soliciting bids from vendors to provide clean up services.

Smoking is a big concern of Hallmark Health as a healthcare provider. Mr. Kelleher explained that changes to signs will be made to make it clear that smoking is not tolerated around the hospital campus.

Mr. Kelleher indicated that the light poles have been reduced in height from 16 feet to 14 feet on a 3-foot base. The fixture remains the same. Mr. Kelleher noted that some light spillage occurs over Porter Street.

Mr. Kelleher explained that there are currently 31 parking spaces currently behind the three structures at 18, 20, and 24 Porter Street. The proposed Upper Porter Street Lot would have 47 parking spaces, a net increase of 16 spaces. Mr. Kelleher explained that the site lacks any substantial buffers with the existing setback being between zero and seven feet.

In response to concerns that the structure at 775 Main Street has historical value that should be protected, Mr. Kelleher explained that the structure has been significantly altered from its original design and offers no historical value. Mr. Kelleher referenced a letter from the Melrose Historical Commission.

Finally, Mr. Kelleher explained that there are no sight line concerns and that the flow in and out of the Lower Porter Street Lot has been reversed to address queuing concerns.

Karen Staffier, civil engineer from VHB, expanded on the discussion of parking counts and buffers within the Upper Porter Street Lot. The existing impervious surfaces extend up to the property lines. A board fence is located along Rowe Street. The proposed plan includes a vegetative buffer of 7 feet at the rear property line, 25 feet for 40 percent of the shared property line with the residential abutter, and 11 feet along Rowe Street. Ms. Staffier presented earlier versions of the plan, including one that had two to three feet of a buffer along the rear. This version provided 24-foot drive aisles, allowing for better circulation, and a net increase of 19 parking spaces. By increasing the amount of buffer space and reducing the drive aisles, the net increase is 16 parking spaces as proposed. Ms. Staffier explained that if the full 25-foot buffer was provided, there would be a net increase of 8 parking spaces. However, this parking lot would have an inefficient layout in that the full length of the drive aisles cannot be used. Finally, a parking lot without any relief, which has the 25-foot buffer and the required setbacks, results in a net decrease of parking spaces. Ms. Staffier stated that the proposed layout for the Upper Porter Street Lot is a balance between the utility of the lot and maximizing the vegetative spaces. Ms. Staffier noted that the proposed plan is a substantial improvement from what exists.

Clara Batchelor, landscape architect with CBA Landscape Architects, explained that there are two changes to the landscaping plan. At the Upper Porter Street Lot, Ms. Batchelor replaced the proposed street trees along Rowe Street with cypress evergreens that would grow to 25 feet. At the rear of the Lower Porter Street Lot, Ms. Batchelor proposed yews that would grow to 6 feet to provide additional screening as requested by the nursing home.

Ms. Staffier explained that the pole height was reduced from 16 feet to 14 feet on a 3-foot base. There is no light spillage on the adjacent properties, although some goes into Porter Street. Ms. Staffier pointed out that there are street lights on Porter Street and Rowe Street and there are flood lights on the existing structures. The proposed fixtures will be installed at about the same height at the existing flood lights, but with the benefit of focusing the light downward rather than out like the flood lights.

Attorney McAvoy summarized the proposed project. He stated that the Applicant has a good plan, which has been reduced in scope by eliminating the parking lot on Rowe Street. Attorney McAvoy indicated that the Applicant has no plan to sell the lots at some later date. Attorney McAvoy noted that the zoning district has very permissive allowances for uses and dimensional and density controls (i.e., minimum lot area of 5,000 square feet, 8 stories, multifamily as of right, etc). He stated that the parking lot use is a very light use for the zoning district considering what is allowed. Attorney McAvoy cited multifamily residential examples at 560 Lebanon Street (10 units on 10,000 square foot lot) and 814 Main Street (6 units on 6,000 square foot lot), which are in the same zoning district. Attorney McAvoy indicated that the proposed parking lots provide more screening and landscaping than the Deering parking lot, which was established prior to Site Plan Review. The proposed project cannot provide complete compliance with the Zoning Ordinance; however, there are improvements to setbacks and screening. Attorney McAvoy noted that a parking lot with a different shape could be completely compliant. Attorney McAvoy noted that strict compliance with the Ordinance may not have desirable outcomes. He stated that the proposed projects meet the objectives of Site Plan Review, and that the plan does not subvert the Ordinance. Attorney McAvoy indicated that the Zoning Board of Appeals has continued their review to December 9, 2015.

At the completion of the Applicant's presentation, Ms. Morelli noted that the public hearing is a continued public hearing and opened the discussion to public comments. Ms. Morelli noted that the Planning Board received a letter with a large number of signatures from the neighborhood. She requested that comments not rehash the letter.

Mark Wixted, 120 Rowe Street, stated that he is a direct abutter to the Upper Porter Street parking lot. He is a registered professional engineer who has personally worked on similar healthcare industry projects. Mr. Wixted stated that the presentation is misleading. There has been no change to the Upper Porter Street Lot since the last meeting. The only difference is the increase of the fence height abutting his property. Mr. Wixted took exception with the fact that only 40 percent of the shared property line will have the required 25-foot buffer. He noted that in this area, no parking could occur because it is the corner. Mr. Wixted stated that the increase of vegetative buffers is good, but the removal of the structures on Porter Street is not. Mr. Wixted noted that no plant list has been provided to address the changes that Ms. Batchelor described. Mr. Wixted also stated that the parking lot on Rowe Street across from the Emergency Department was misrepresented. The lot was removed from the plan when the Applicant realized that the Emergency Department could not be renovated and would be moved to meet the Applicant's objectives. Mr. Wixted noted that the Applicant has not provided any justification on why the requested Variances are warranted and they do not meet the criteria to approve a Variance (topography, lot shape, and soil conditions). Mr. Wixted stated that Variances are easily appealed and the City would have to defend the plan against any appeal using taxpayers' dollars. Mr. Wixted stated that the 25-foot residential buffer is the most important element of the plan. Mr. Wixted requested that the acoustical analysis be peer reviewed. He stated that the analysis did not say that there would be no increase of noise, and that there may be opportunities for other mitigation besides the proposed fence. He stated that he disagreed with the acoustical consultant's statements regarding the level of noise once the houses are removed. Mr. Wixted stated that he does not believe that Hallmark Health has been truthful or upfront on their plans. He stated that more information is needed on the overall master plan and parking. Mr. Wixted asked why the phased master plan is not reviewed as one single project.

Ms. Morelli indicated that the project was not presented as a master plan. The Planning Board only have purview over Phase 1, which is the subject of the Site Plan Review application. The Applicant was asked to provide information on the future phases just to provide context.

Continuing, Mr. Wixted indicated that he will hold his comments on the future phases, but he is interested in whether the proposed parking garage would require payment for parking as that would impact the neighborhood streets. Mr. Wixted also indicated that he had submitted a plan for Porter Street which included narrowing the street and a tree belt. He stated that the hospital seems to be annexing Porter Street as part of their campus and therefore upgrades to that street should be considered for mitigation.

Bruce Herrmann, 20 Bellevue Avenue, stated that the piecemeal approach to the review needs to be addressed with a single project. Mr. Herrmann indicated that there is a benefit to the community to better engage the neighborhood. A coherent master plan would be beneficial as it is the basis for good design decisions. Mr. Herrmann also stated that the design standard of a 5 year storm is not consistent with current practices. He stated that greater measures to mitigate a 100 year storm should be included.

Beth Ruggeri-Koret, 105 Rowe Street, asked for an explanation on why the additional parking spaces are necessary. Ms. Ruggeri-Koret asked if the 25-foot residential buffer was necessary on Rowe Street. She stated that she could not clearly hear Ms. Batchelor's presentation but it sounded like evergreen species would be planted to prevent people from walking in and out of the parking lot.

Ms. Morelli asked Ms. Batchelor to clarify her comments regarding evergreen species along Rowe Street. Ms. Batchelor explained that the installation height would be 10 to 12 feet, which would grow up to 25 feet, and they would be pretty much touching.

Bill Keefe, 17 Beverly Street, stated that a large number of people from the neighborhood have signed onto the letter that was transmitted to the Planning Board. Mr. Keefe stated that the proposal is not consistent with the neighborhood. The suggested improvements are not great for the neighborhood. For example, the stockade fence on Rowe Street that will be removed seems like something you would see in a neighborhood. Mr. Keefe asked for a justification of the number of spaces especially when there appears to be many available spaces at the two offsite lots (Deering Parking Lot and Square One Mall). Mr. Keefe expressed surprise to see the benches still included in the plan. He stated that no one at the previous meeting expressed support for the benches due to the relationship with smokers and trash. Mr. Keefe asked how many parking spaces are proposed in a new garage. He also asked how the recent changes to operations, becoming primarily an outpatient facility, at Lawrence Memorial in Medford will affect Melrose-Wakefield. Mr. Keefe also stated that the comparison to the Deering Lot is not accurate as that parking lot is not in the middle of a neighborhood and is adjacent to the railroad. Mr. Keefe suggested that the Applicant move Dr. Torraca to the structure at the corner of Porter Street and Rowe Street.

Steve Manwell, 121 Rowe Street, stated that he agrees with the letter that was submitted and with what the other speakers have stated. He noted that the hospital is the tallest building in Melrose and that raises the profile of any project undertaken by the Applicant. The focus on the required 25-foot residential buffer is warranted and it deserves full compliance. Mr. Manwell indicated that the neighborhood is subjected to an industrial level of noise 24 hours a day. Being a neighbor on Rowe Street, Mr. Manwell stated that the hospital has a less than stellar record of noise mitigation. Mr. Manwell also made a technical comment. The Site Plan Review Ordinance requires the submittal of the height and uses of adjacent buildings. He notes that only Mr. Wixted's property is shown on the plans, but that more information should be required for an accurate review.

Dr. Paul Torraca, 12 Porter Street, described his discussions with the Applicant. Dr. Torraca explained that moving his practice to 775 Main Street was not agreeable to the Applicant. Dr. Torraca stated that the Applicant did not want Dr. Torraca to move. Dr. Torraca explained that their meetings have been cooperative. However, he stated that the 3 parking spaces offered are not adequate for his desired circulation around his building at 12 Porter Street. Dr. Torraca explained that it is not feasible because his, employees', and patients' vehicles occupy most of the paved area around his building.

Kate Kennen, 59 Hillside Avenue, stated that she is a landscape architect. Ms. Kennen stated that she believes that the Applicant should present a master plan for the entire project rather than a piecemeal approach. She stated that trees on East Emerson Street were removed and have not been replaced. Ms. Kennen noted that she appreciates having a community hospital in Melrose.

Melissa Wu, 70 East Emerson Street, stated that she moved to Melrose because it is an integrated community in terms of mixing residential and business areas. Ms. Wu stated that she had a difficult time looking for more information regarding later phases. She stated that a master plan approach would be more beneficial as it would illuminate other opportunities for mitigation. She stated that she appreciates the points made by the Applicant regarding the improvement of landscaping, but there will still be the loss of the structures on Porter Street. Ms. Wu stated that she would like a better understanding of the full picture.

Andy Monat, 57 West Hill Avenue, stated that constructing parking spaces in a garage is very expensive, as is the cost of surface parking. Mr. Monat suggested that the Applicant should be required to institute parking demand management rather than construct new parking spaces. He suggested that the Applicant could incentivize the use of alternative modes of transportation as there are many options such as running a shuttle to Oak Grove.

Jason Gracilieri, 26 Hillside Avenue, stated that he also agrees that this project should be reviewed as part of an overall master plan. It offers a better opportunity for a more complete review.

Seeing no one else who wished to comment, Ms. Morelli stated that the meeting is a continued public hearing so there will be other opportunities for comment. Mr. Cassavoy observed that there were many new people in attendance and a brief overview of the master plan from the Applicant would be beneficial. Ms. Morelli agreed and suggested a short recess at 9:05 pm.

At 9:20pm, Ms. Morelli called the meeting back to order. She indicated that an overview of the Applicant's future plans would be beneficial at this time. Ms. Morelli stated that this information was provided with the application materials to help give the Planning Board context during their review. Ms. Gaffey stated that the provision in the Site Plan Review Ordinance regarding phasing was misinterpreted. She stated that that the provision was written to prevent applicants from splitting a project into smaller pieces to avoid Site Plan Review, not that phased projects need to be presented as a single project. Ms. Gaffey stated that all phases of the Applicant's master plan will be subject to Site Plan Review.

Marty McKnight, 11 Beverly Street, asked if the proposed parking garage and the new patient wing have been designed. Ms. Morelli responded that the Applicant has a sense of what will fit on the site, but the design is conceptual at this point in time.

Ms. Morelli asked Mr. Kelleher to provide a brief overview of the master plan. Mr. Kelleher stated that the need for the surface parking lots is to set up the series of steps necessary to construct a new patient wing on the campus. Mr. Kelleher indicated that the question Hallmark Health wants to answer is how to better accommodate the community that is served by the hospital. Mr. Kelleher also noted that the

standard for inpatient rooms is approximately 360 square feet. Melrose-Wakefield Hospital has inpatient rooms of about 90 square feet. Further, the technological advances would be accommodated in a more modern hospital. Mr. Kelleher stated that the Emergency Department is approximately 6,600 square feet and has 41,000 emergency visits a year. At a hospital that Mr. Kelleher recently visited, the Emergency Department is 47,000 square feet and has 51,000 visits a year, so there is an obvious mismatch at Melrose-Wakefield. Mr. Kelleher indicated that an emergency patient at Melrose-Wakefield is likely to be found in the hallway because the spatial needs of the Emergency Department are not met in its current configuration.

Mr. Kelleher asked how the hospital can address the needs of the Emergency Department and inpatients. Mr. Kelleher stated that the best location for a new patient wing is in the area of the existing parking garage. He noted that it would be unrealistic for the new wing to be located at the corner of Lebanon Street and East Emerson Street due to the location of the main building, but it is a good location for a parking garage. The solution is to raze the existing parking garage and the 1951 building and construct the addition in that location. The Emergency Department would be located on the ground floor, which would remove ambulance traffic from Rowe Street. Labor and delivery and maternity could be located on the second floor, whereas currently these departments are on separate floors. On the third and fourth floor, surgery suites and medical/surgery inpatient rooms could be accommodated. Mr. Kelleher indicated that there would not be an increase in beds. Finally, Mr. Kelleher indicated that the 1979 building would be renovated. Mr. Kelleher stated that this master plan could be completed in five years on an ideal timeframe.

Mr. McKnight, 11 Beverly Street, asked about the intended construction timeframe for the surface parking lots. Mr. Kelleher indicated 6 months in 2016.

Ms. Korman, 33 East Emerson Street, asked about Department of Public Health review and approval. Mr. Kelleher explained that the Department of Public Health will need to review and approval any project. Mr. Kelleher noted that the affiliation with Partners HealthCare is on hold. He stated that Hallmark Health can complete the master plan by itself, but it is better to work with a larger health care organization. He stated that the strong affiliation is necessary to meet patient needs.

Mr. McKnight, 11 Beverly Street, asked how much parking is needed. Mr. Kelleher responded that employees do not park offsite during the evenings for safety reasons. He indicated that it is very challenging for employees to find parking onsite. Mr. Kelleher noted that the Rowe Street parking lot is no longer planned and is not part of the master plan.

Ms. Korman, 33 East Emerson Street, asked why the parking count needs to be increased if the number of beds is not increasing. Mr. Kelleher indicated that the hospital needs the parking today.

Ms. Wu, 70 East Emerson Street, asked for Mr. Kelleher to describe the parking garage in more detail. Mr. Kelleher stated that Hallmark Health is sensitive to the appearance of the garage. He noted that the existing garage leaves much to be desired. Mr. Kelleher indicated that ideally the garage would have one level underground to reduce the overall height. Ms. Morelli explained that with every phase of the master plan Hallmark Health will return to the Planning Board for Site Plan Review.

Mr. Gracilieri, 26 Hillside Avenue, asked what the projected volume increase of visits is for the hospital. Mr. Kelleher indicated that they believe there will be a 1 to 2 percent annual growth. He indicated that Hallmark Health does not expect a decrease in emergency visits as some other health care providers have indicated is a trend. Mr. Gracilieri asked why parking would need to increase if the annual growth is so small. Elizabeth Bahnuk, the Director of Facility Planning and Development, introduced herself and

indicated that the parking count is based on the square footage of the facility. Ms. Bahnuk stated that as the square footage of the facility increases, the number of parking spaces needs to increase. She stated that the Zoning Ordinance requires 1 parking space per 600 square feet. Ms. Bahnuk noted that currently there are 440 parking spaces, which is 40 spaces short of the requirement of 480 spaces calculated based on the hospital's current square footage.

Mr. Monat, 58 West Hill Avenue, stated that the Applicant should request a variance for a reduction in the number of required parking spaces. He stated that there are obvious concerns about the parking garage and that the community does not think it's necessary. Ms. Morelli reminded Mr. Monat that only the surface lots are under consideration at this time. Mr. Monat asked why the surface parking lots are needed. Ms. Morelli explained that there is a deficit of parking spaces on the campus currently. The Applicant needs 40 more spaces to meet the zoning requirement.

Ms. Morelli asked Dr. Torraca if he would be losing parking spaces with the current proposal. Dr. Torraca indicated that he would lose spaces. Ms. Morelli asked how many parking spaces and clarified that these should be legal parking spaces. Dr. Torraca explained that the Applicant is taking away land that he is using for parking. There are 6 employees with 5 to 7 vehicles, and he tries to leave 2 to 3 spaces available for patients. Ms. Morelli asked if vehicles are not parked on his property, where do they park. Dr. Torraca stated that Porter Street has a two hour time limit. He acknowledges that he and his employees currently use parking spaces on the Applicant's property. Dr. Torraca stated that about a year ago, the Applicant offered to relocate his practice to a Hallmark Health property on Main Street. Dr. Torraca stated that they did not come to an agreement, but he is still open to negotiation.

Mr. Cassavoy agreed with the commenter that the 5 year storm event is too small for a stormwater management design, but it is the City's standard. Mr. Cassavoy asked Ms. Staffier if she could provide more information about the drainage design. Ms. Staffier explained that the drainage study complies with the Department of Environmental Protection's requirements and the 5-year design standard. She noted that the drainage system is designed to the 100-year storm event.

Mr. Welch asked if the proposed broadband alarm devices would be included in the project construction. Mr. Kelleher said they could be.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward stated that there are options for redesigning the Upper Porter Street Lot. She suggested reducing the vegetative buffer along Porter Street in order to increase the buffer at the rear of the lot adjacent to the residential abutter. Ms. Staffier stated that it may require additional variances.

Mr. Sadowski clarified that if the Applicant went to the extreme along Porter Street, the 25-foot buffer could never be achieved. Ms. Staffier stated that Mr. Sadowski is correct. Mr. Sadowski thought it would still be worth exploring. Ms. Staffier stated that the design provides more streetscape along Porter Street. Ms. Morelli stated that based on the comments received, Rowe Street should receive more attention than Porter Street. Ms. Batchelor noted that the original landscape plan showed a traditional streetscape with street trees. The revised landscape plan included a solid screen with the additional of evergreen plants, which is not a traditional streetscape. Mr. Mercado asked about adding a fence. Ms. Batchelor indicated that it could be added.

Mr. Mercado asked about the construction timeline. Mr. Kelleher indicated that it would take 6 months.

Ms. Morelli asked if the Applicant was open to a condition that to require the broadband back up alarms as proposed. Mr. Kelleher indicated he would be. Ms. Morelli stated she asked because she wondered if it

would limit the pool of potential contractors. Mr. Kelleher indicated that the type of broadband alarm proposed is widely available.

Mr. Cassavoy stated that if the Upper Porter Street Lot incorporated the full 25-foot residential buffer, the resulting number of spaces plus the spaces in the Lower Porter Street lot would make up the deficit of parking spaces on the campus. Attorney McAvoy pointed out that the Applicant would still require variances for the rear yard setbacks and the driveway openings.

Mr. Mercado asked about improvements to Porter Street. Attorney McAvoy noted that the Applicant has no authority to alter Porter Street and does not feel that at this time it is appropriate to propose alterations without further conversations with city officials.

Ms. Morelli asked about the care and maintenance of the landscaping. Mr. Kelleher indicated that Hallmark Health is soliciting bids from vendors to provide maintenance for the campus. Ms. Morelli asked what that would include. Mr. Kelleher indicated that it would include general upkeep and trash removal. Ms. Morelli asked if the Applicant could accept a condition to that affect. Mr. Kelleher responded affirmatively.

Ms. Morelli stated that she was surprised to see the benches still in the plan. Attorney McAvoy stated that it seemed like the Board was split on the benefit. Ms. Morelli stated that benches with maintenance are good, but without maintenance, it would be an attractive nuisance. Mr. Sadowski stated that he appreciated the initial reasoning for the benches, but the concern is with smokers, which is a larger issue.

Mr. Sadowski indicated his agreement with Ms. DeSouza-Ward's suggestion to minimize the buffer on Porter Street and maximize the residential buffer. Mr. Sadowski stated that the first block of Porter Street is commercial and may not need the substantial buffer along the street. Attorney McAvoy asked far how the Applicant should go. Mr. Sadowski stated that the residential buffer should increase appreciably. Mr. Sadowski also suggested reducing the width of the drive aisles. He stated that the zoning aside, he would like to see the best design.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward suggested considering angled parking to reduce the width of the drive aisle further. She stated that although the parking lots only operate during the day, the residential buffer is important.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward asked how the day time operation would be policed. Mr. Kelleher indicated that the swipe cards would only be issued to day time shift employees.

Mr. King asked what the previous use of the structures that will be demolished was. Mr. Kelleher indicated that the structures were formally doctor offices, and more recently, were office space for Hallmark Health staff.

Mr. Mercado asked about the changes to the Lower Porter Street Lot. Ms. Staffier summarized that the height of the light fixtures was reduced, the vegetation height abutting EPOCH was increased, and the circulation through the parking lot was reversed.

Mr. Mercado stated that 21 parking spaces are proposed in the Lower Porter Street Lot, so to meet the zoning requirement for parking, only 19 parking spaces are necessary in the Upper Porter Street Lot. Attorney McAvoy noted that 19 spaces would be a decrease in the number of spaces available behind the structures now.

Bill Dowdall, 50 Howard Street, stated that he has been thinking about the layout of the Upper Porter Street Lot during the course of the meeting. He suggested that the Applicant should consider tandem parking.

Attorney McAvoy responded that tandem parking is not allowed by the Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Morelli indicated that tandem parking may need to be staffed like a valet and a different model than what was discussed so far.

Ms. Morelli stated that the Planning Board would appreciate one more pass at the Upper Porter Street Lot. With an acceptable plan, the Planning Board may be prepared to give a positive recommendation to the Board of Appeals. Ms. Morelli noted that an acceptable plan may require additional or different variances than what has been applied for by the Applicant. Ms. Morelli suggested that the public hearing be continued to November 16, 2015. Attorney McAvoy agreed to the continuance.

Mr. Sadowski asked the Planning Staff to clearly state the waivers that are requested. Ms. Gaffey stated that for both cases, Case 15-006 and 15-007, the waivers are the same and include:

- A site plan that shows foundation lines of the proposed buildings, gross floor area, and building height;
- A site plan that shows the location of solid waste containers and the nature of any required screening;
- A façade rendering; and
- Sign renderings.

Mr. Sadowski stated that these waivers seem reasonable due to the fact that the projects are site projects and not building projects. He also stated that showing the heights and uses of adjacent buildings was reasonable to waive, although not requested by the Applicant. He is inclined to grant the waivers. Ms. DeSouza-Ward agreed.

Mr. Cassavoy MADE a MOTION to waive the requested items including a Site Plan that shows the heights and uses of all buildings abutting the proposed project. Mr. Mercado SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Mr. Mercado stated that the benches should be eliminated for the proposed project. Ms. Morelli added that an updated landscaping plan and plant list should be submitted, plus any plans that need to be updated so that the Planning Board has a complete package.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward MADE a MOTION to continue the public hearing to November 16, 2015, and to discuss the Planning Board's recommendation to the Board of Appeals. Mr. Mercado SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Documents: Site Plan Review Responses prepared by Hallmark Health with the following attachments:

1. Revised Construction Management Plan
2. Broadband (White Noise) White Paper
3. Broadband (White Noise) Specification
4. Hallmark Health Smoking Policy
5. Light Pole Specification
6. Illustrative Photometric Plan
7. Layout Options for the Upper Porter Street Lot (Parking Counts and Buffers)
8. Upper and Lower Parking Lot Rendering
9. Upper and Lower Parking Lot Sections

10. Lower Porter Street Parking Lot Revised Plans (Sheets C-2, C-3, & SL-1)
Letter from Jim Bennett, Melrose Historical Commission, to Denise Gaffey, Director and
City Planner, regarding demolitions dated October 19, 2015
Letter from Abutters and Additional Signatories to Letter, dated October 13, 2015
Letter from Attorney Patrick McAvoy to Planning Board, responding to abutter's letter,
dated October 21, 2015
Letter from Paul Johnson, Building Commissioner, to Attorney Patrick McAvoy
regarding zoning relief, dated October 6, 2015

NEXT MEETING

A Special Meeting is scheduled for Monday, November 2, 2015.

The next Regular Meetings are scheduled for Monday, November 16 and December 14, 2015.

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 PM.