**MELROSE PLANNING BOARD**
**MEETING MINUTES**
**Special Meeting and Public Hearing**
**Monday, September 21, 2015**
**7:45 PM**
**Milano Senior Center, Second Floor, 201 West Foster Street**

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

**ABSENT:** Ed Cassidy

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.

**BOARD OF APPEALS**

Case 15-024, 775 Main Street and 8 Porter Street, Hallmark Health Corporation (October 14, 2015)
Case 15-025, 18, 20, and 24 Porter Street, Hallmark Health Corporation (October 14, 2015)

Ms. Morelli noted that the Planning Board will provide a non-binding recommendation to the Board of Appeals regarding the Applicant's requests. Ms. Morelli suggested to the members of the Planning Board that the Board should consider the two Board of Appeals cases following the presentation by the Applicant on the Site Plan Review applications and any public testimony.

Mr. Cassavoy MADE a MOTION to take the agenda out of order. Ms. DeSouza-Ward SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Document: ZBA Application Case 15-024
ZBA Application Case 15-025

**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)

Ms. Morelli gave an overview of the public hearing. She noted that both applications will be considered together for the ease of presentation. The Applicant will give a presentation of the two projects. There will then be time for the Planning Board members to ask questions. Finally, the public hearing would be opened.

Ms. Morelli noted that the Board is aware that this project is the first phase of a master plan proposed by the Applicant. In the future, the Board will have the opportunity to review the subsequent phases, but right now, the only applications are for the two surface parking lots. Ms. Morelli explained the criteria for Site Plan Review.

Alan MacDonald, the president and CEO of Hallmark Health, thanked the Board for their time. Mr. MacDonald explained that the advice and comments from the Board will be invaluable. He introduced

Hugh Kelleher, Vice President of Support and Ancillary Services, who provided a more detailed overview of the project.

Mr. Kelleher stated that Hallmark Health is working on a master plan for the Melrose-Wakefield Hospital campus to modernize the facilities. Mr. Kelleher explained that the 1979 building houses most of the patient care provides rooms which are approximately 90 square feet. The ultimate goal of the master plan is a construct a modern patient care wing, where rooms are approximately 320 square feet. To construct a new wing, the campus must be prepared. The first phase is the two surface parking lots proposed, which will require the demolition of 5 structures on property owned by Hallmark Health. The existing parking garage needs repairs and can be difficult to navigate through. Mr. Kelleher explained that Hallmark Health considered renovation of the 1979 building, but quickly realized it would not be sufficient. Additionally, the emergency department just does not have enough space to operate. Mr. Kelleher explained that the best course of action is to raze the older 1951 building and the existing parking garage to construct the new patient wing in addition to interior renovations as well as a new garage.

Mr. Kelleher explained that other key tasks will be accomplished with the new patient care wing. The emergency department will be accommodated on the ground floor, moving ambulances off of Porter, Rowe and East Emerson Streets. Imaging (CT scans and x-rays) would move out of trailers and into the building. A new parking garage would be constructed with access from Lebanon Street only, alleviating the effects of vehicle recirculation. Maternity and labor and delivery will be located on the second floor of the new wing. The third floor would house general medical/surgery rooms and large ICU rooms. The fourth floor would be more medical/surgery rooms. The 1979 building will be renovated as the final phase of the project.

Ms. Morelli asked for the buildout timeframe. Mr. Kelleher indicated that the garage would take ten to eleven months, and the new wing would take 3.5 years. Ms. Morelli confirmed that each phase would return to the Planning Board and Board of Appeals. Ms. Morelli clarified the phases: surface parking lots, new garage, new wing, and internal renovations. Mr. Mercado noted that the existing garage would not be demolished until the new garage is operational. Mr. Welch confirmed that the parking for the medical suites would also be accommodated in the new garage.

Attorney Patrick McAvoy introduced the consultant team.

Karen Staffier, civil engineer from VHB, described the existing conditions and the proposed conditions. The Lower Porter Street lot would have two curb cuts, which will be access controlled. The surface lots will be used 8am to 5pm on weekdays. The design is to create safe and efficient vehicle movements. The goal was to increase the amount of pervious surfaces and keep the paved areas to the interior of the site. The Lower Porter Street lot would accommodate 21 parking spaces, including one van accessible space. The Upper Porter Street lot would accommodate 47 parking spaces via a single curb cut. Landscaping is proposed along the perimeter of the parking lot. The sidewalk on Porter Street will be reconstructed.

Ms. Staffier explained that new lighting would be installed. Currently, the structures have conventional flood lights attached. The surface lots would have a total of three light poles with LED fixtures.

Ms. Staffier explained that underground drainage systems would be installed. There are no stormwater controls currently, and water sheet flows to the street. The underground system would provide infiltration and would increase the quality of the stormwater before it discharges.

Clara Batchelor, landscape architect with CBA Landscape Architects, described that the intent is to create an attractive streetscape through a landscaped edge. Ms. Batchelor explained that there would be variety

of shade trees installed. The smaller shrubs would hide the car headlights. Along both parking lots, a low wall will be installed. The seat wall will cut in in some places, providing an area for a bench to be installed. The smaller plants are a mix of evergreen and deciduous plants that will provide a mix of colors. Many of these smaller plants die back, accommodating snow storage. Ms. Batchelor explained that at the Upper Porter Street lot, an evergreen screen of arborvitaes will be installed with a height of 12 feet, which will grow to 30 feet. The Lower Porter Street lot will include a screen of *ilex* evergreens and shade tree is proposed for the middle island. Ms. Batchelor explained that no invasive species will be used. The plants proposed are mostly native and are very hardy.

Ms. Morelli asked if there will be irrigation. Drip irrigation would be installed.

Mr. Welch indicated that more snow storage will be necessary. Mr. Kelleher stated that all snow will be removed from the lots.

Elizabeth Ruggeri-Koret, 105 Rowe Street, asked how tall the shrubs are proposed on the Rowe Street side of the Upper Porter Street lot. Ms. Batchelor explained that they will be approximately 4 feet tall. Ms. Ruggeri-Koret did not think that would be tall enough to screen headlights. Ms. Batchelor stated that a different plant that achieves a greater height could be used. Ms. Morelli requested that all comments be held until the public hearing is opened at the conclusion of the presentation.

Sean Manning, traffic engineer from VHB, described the traffic impacts. Mr. Manning explained that traffic counts were completed during the spring. He also noted that the traffic analysis refers to the Rowe Street parking lot, which is not in the project. Mr. Manning explained that phase 1 will have an incremental impact. The parking lots are for staff use only; each space would be filled and emptied once per day. Mr. Manning noted that there is a peak hour shift as hospital staff typically arrived earlier than a typical commercial business. Mr. Manning stated that the analysis shows a negligible change. He stated that at the signalized intersection of Lebanon Street and Porter Street, there will be an increase of 15 seconds of delay in the build condition. Mr. Manning stated that since the analysis includes the Rowe Street lot, the delay might actually be less. The entire master plan was included in the study and the consultant represented that the analysis is conservative. The full build out would cause minor changes to the traffic around the hospital campus. Mr. Manning stated that the overall project would result in low impacts.

Doug Bell, acoustic engineer from Cavanaugh Tocci Associates, explained that sound monitors captured noise for 7 days to establish a baseline. The analysis represents a conservative approach as it considered that every space in the lots would be occupied. Mr. Bell explained that the background sound is approximately 54 decibels, which decreases as you get closer to the residential neighbors. The proposed activities in the surface parking lots could create little to no acoustic impact. However, Mr. Bell noted that a sound barrier fence, approximately 8 feet tall, will be installed at the rear of the Upper Porter Street lot.

Attorney McAvoy described the zoning relief that the proposed project would require. The parking requirement based on the calculation in the Ordinance of one space per 600 square feet is 480 parking spaces. Currently, the hospital has 441 parking spaces. The proposed surface lots would create 68 parking spaces, which would boost the number of parking spaces at the hospital over the requirement. Attorney McAvoy explained that a determination of whether the lots are principal or accessory uses needs to be made, both of which require a special permit. He stated that the Applicant has requested both special permits for both lots. There are also a number of variances needed. Since both parking lots will be considered corner lots, there are two front yards and two rear yards. The Lower Porter Street lot requires rear yard variances. Attorney McAvoy did state, however, if the parking lots are considered accessory uses, then there is no rear yard variance necessary. The Upper Porter Street lot requires a front yard

variance on Rowe Street and rear yard variances. Additionally, the Upper Porter Street lot does not have the required 25 feet buffer adjacent to a residential district. Finally, the curb cuts are too wide and too close together.

At the conclusion of the presentation, Ms. Morelli asked if the Board would like to open the hearing for public participation. Mr. Mercado MADE a MOTION to open the hearing to public participation. Mr. Welch SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Joanna Manwell, 121 Rowe Street, questioned the noise analysis and the location of the sound monitoring devices placed behind the existing structures on Porter Street. She wondered how the analysis could be accurate when the structures that are proposed to be demolished act as a buffer from the everyday noise of the hospital.

Ellen Shore, 29 Hillside Avenue, prepared remarks. Ms. Morelli asked if the remarks were representative of a larger group, or of her own. Ms. Shore indicated that they are her own. Ms. Shore questioned how Phase 1 could be approved if it is questionable that the later phases may not be approved or are even appropriate. Ms. Shore stated that she had read an article in the Melrose Free Press about improvements to the hospital. She stated that the word "improvements" is subjective. It may be an improvement for the hospital, but not for the neighborhood. She stated that the hospital may improve and they will continue to pay no taxes to the City while using City services. She stated that the master plan is an encroachment on a quiet neighborhood. Ms. Shore believed that the proposed landscaping will not outweigh the appearance of a garage, which will detract from the Victorian homes present in the neighborhood. Ms. Shore noted that the Rowe Street lot is not proposed "at this time". She stated that Ward 4 will become a sea of concrete and asphalt. Ms. Shore stated that the hospital's neighbors are not satisfied. There has been the bare minimum of outreach to the neighborhood. Ms. Shore objected to the hospital's assumption that the project would be approved as evidenced by moving staff from the houses and cutting utilities. She stated that even though the hospital is the biggest employer, it does not offset the loss of tax revenue. Ms. Morelli asked if Ms. Shore has specific comments related to the cases in front of the Planning Board. Ms. Shore asked if the traffic analysis incorporated the near miss accidents in the neighborhood. She noted that the hospital committed in the 1970s to not destroy the neighborhood. Ms. Shore suggested that the hospital should provide more beautification and flood control. She stated that the East Emerson edge has been subjected to poor maintenance. Ms. Shore wondered why the community needs the proposed project. She also questioned whether the noise studies considered the generators and ACs present at the hospital.

Mark Wixted, 120 Rowe Street, noted that his family has lived at his house for 14 years with full knowledge of living near a hospital. Mr. Wixted indicated that he is a civil engineer with similar experience as the hospital's consultant team. He agrees with the sentiment that the hospital needs improvement and that improvements will be good for the community and the neighborhood. Mr. Wixted stated that he is surprised by the zoning relief requested by the Applicant. When he moved to his house, Mr. Wixted reviewed the zoning ordinance and noted that there was a 25 foot buffer requirement for locations where commercial or industrial zones abut residential zones. He is surprised that what he thought was unthinkable may occur with the granting of a variance from this requirement. He noted that the proposed arborvitae and fence are not what is intended in the zoning ordinance. Mr. Wixted suggested revisions to the Applicant to move parking spaces out of the 25 foot buffer and is dismayed to see that it hasn't happened. He noted that the lighting plan shows light spillage onto adjacent properties. He asked if the pole height identified in the plans include foundation heights. He noted that it appears the two-headed fixture is not shielded; he requested specifications and cut sheets. Mr. Wixted echoed his neighbor's comment about the accuracy of the noise analysis since the structures would be removed and that there were likely snow piles when the sound was observed. Mr. Wixted noted that the loading dock generates a

lot of noise, and he asked for clarification on the hours. He noted that the traffic study did not use trip generation, which would have resulted in a better analysis. Mr. Wixted stated that he appreciates that the hospital is planning a master plan, but they should have also completed a parking study. He noted that upkeep and maintenance of the campus has been lacking and for the proposed parking lots, it will be important. Mr. Wixted suggested that that underground storage tanks should be moved as far away from the residential structures are possible to avoid any water issues. He noted that snow management is not discussed in the materials, and indicated that the back up alarms of snow plows will impact the neighborhood. He also asked how a snow plow will negotiate the gates. He questioned the purpose of the benches. He believes that the benches would be used by smokers rather than those looking to rest. Finally, Mr. Wixted requested that the Planning Board establish a subcommittee to review the project. Ms. Morelli stated that the public hearing will remain open until the time that the Board is ready to make a decision.

Elizabeth Ruggeri-Koret, 105 Rowe Street, stated that demolishing the houses will destroy the residential neighborhood. She stated that the house at the corner of Porter Street and Rowe Street is important for her as it provides a buffer from the main campus. She reiterated her earlier comment that the low shrubs will not serve any purpose. She too is concerned with the proposed benches and smokers as well as trash that is left behind. She is also concerned with the stormwater tanks. She stated that she has had water in her basement and would prefer that the tanks are moved further from residential structures. Ms. Ruggeri-Koret is opposed to the 25-foot buffer variance request.

Marty McKnight, 11 Beverly Street, expressed concern with construction traffic. He noted that Beverly Street is becoming a cut through road. After the project is completed, he is also concerned with employee traffic, since Porter is a one-way street, a driver only has a few choices. Mr. McKnight asked for the applicant to consider traffic controls to keep hospital traffic out of the neighborhood as well as other traffic calming measures.

Sondra Korman, 33 East Emerson Street, explained that she is not a direct abutter to the proposed surface parking lots, but the overall master plan will impact her. She asked why the hospital needs the parking spaces because the Executive Summary indicated that the spaces will supplement the new patient care wing. She asked how many spaces will be required, and suggested that the Board cannot just consider this application alone. Ms. Korman asked how the Planning Board could recommend approval of the additional spaces when they focus on reducing the number of parking spaces as well as encourage public transportation and other alternatives elsewhere. She stated that the traffic study cannot be accurate due to the amount of roadway construction that has occurred around the hospital campus recently. Ms. Korman observed that previously there had been excellent landscaping along East Emerson Street, but now most trees are dead and have not been replaced. Ms. Korman stated that the hospital has not lived up to previous approvals.

Ms. Ruggeri-Koret, 105 Rowe Street, expressed concern with decreasing property values as a result of these projects.

William Dowdall, 50 Howard Street, understood that the two parking lots would be temporary until completion of the full master plan. He stated that if that is true, it is an incredible expense to demolish the structures and construct the lots. Mr. Dowdall indicated that the same money could be used to increase the shuttle services. He also noted that there is no mention of the dentist office.

Christine Shirey, 50 Howard Street, clarified that the dentist office referred to by Mr. Dowdall is the building at 775 Main Street, which was formally a dentist's office. She stated that she loves having a community hospital and has been there quite a bit in the past two weeks for a variety of reasons. Ms. Shirey noted that the architect of the building at 775 Main Street was an employee of Royal Barry Wills,

but does not reflect the classic style of Wills. Hugh Stubbins established his own firm and has his own international fame. Ms. Shirey stated that the removal of this structure should be reconsidered.

Kevin Donovan, 64 Hillside Avenue, noted that the Applicant was open to compromise when he met with them last year. He asked if the Applicant was open to a dialogue to find an agreeable solution.

Elise Brown, 16 Beverly Street, asked how the new parking lots fit in with the overall parking policy. Employees park at the Square One Mall and at Deering Lumber and are shuttled. Ms. Brown asked what shifts will use the proposed parking lots. Ms. Morelli explained that employees will continue to be shuttled to the Square One Mall and the Deering Lumber site.

Bill Keefe, 17 Beverly Street, recognizes the importance of the hospital. He knows that the hospital was here before him. He has reviewed the project with the Applicant. He noted that the Applicant was mistaken to not include more neighboring streets in their communication because he would have appreciated the opportunity to have earlier input. He noted that the removal of the Rowe Street lot was the result of participation by Hillside Avenue residents. Mr. Keefe suggested that the Applicant include the same number of parking spaces proposed in the future parking garage. He appreciates the existing structures because although they are medical offices they appear to be part of the neighborhood. He is concerned with the aesthetics of the parking lots and the resulting traffic. The project area is a high visibility location in Melrose which has a certain character. It is hard to envision the project area as proposed by the Applicant. Mr. Keefe indicated that he is pleased that the parking lots would be access controlled. He wondered about the future though. Ms. Morelli indicated that it could be a condition of the Planning Board's Decision as well as the Board of Appeal's Decision. Mr. Keefe echoed Mr. McKnight's comment about neighborhood traffic due to the one-way direction of Porter Street. Finally, Mr. Keefe also echoed his neighbors' concerns about smokers congregating at the proposed benches.

Mr. Wixted, 120 Rowe, suggested that the traffic study should have concrete mitigation commitments. He provided a plan that shows a narrower Porter Street.

Ed Davis, 47 Porter Street, asked for more information on the staff that would use the proposed parking lots. He also asked that the Applicant submit a report that describes the effect on property values.

Stephen Meuse, formerly of 117 First Street where his parents still reside, stated that since the hospital planned on demolishing the houses for ER parking and now propose to move the ER to the ground level of the new patient care wing, they should sell the houses since presumably there is no need for them if they were to be demolished. Mr. Meuse understands that the proposed projects are enabling, and if the proposed parking lots are only temporary, the parking spaces could be relocated and the houses sold. He asked if bicycle parking is proposed. Mr. Meuse noted that he is traffic engineer and asked what else the Applicant will do as mitigation for the traffic impacts.

Paul Torraca, 12 Porter Street, owns the dentist office that remains between the two parking lots. Mr. Torraca explained that he has a small driveway on the west side of the property and rear parking. He and his staff have used the driveway at 18 Porter Street for access for many years. He and his employees park their vehicles in such a way to create 3 patient parking spaces on his property. Mr. Torraca indicated that he has had conversations with the Applicant about accommodating circular access via his driveway and the driveway at 18 Porter Street. He noted that anyone can exit the parking lots as the gate will sense a vehicle so he and his staff do not need special privileges. However, because of the number of vehicles he and his staff have, the circular access cannot be created. Mr. Torraca noted that the general maintenance of the campus is low. He noted that the later phases may be dependent on a merger for the influx of money. If the merger does not happen, Mr. Torraca asked what happens to the Master Plan.

Ms. Manwell, 121 Rowe Street, stated that employees will short cut through the landscaped areas. She suggested a fence so the plants are not trampled. Ms. Manwell reiterated her concern that the existing structures create a buffer from loading dock noise.

Ms. Shirey, 50 Howard Street, stated that EPOCH is an ugly and very long building. Without the structures on Porter Street, that building will now be visible from Porter Street.

Seeing no other attendees wanting to speak, Mr. Cassavoy noted that the City Engineer's position is currently vacant. He asked if the applications need to be peer reviewed. Ms. Gaffey did not think it was necessary, and stated the position will be filled in the very near future. Ms. Gaffey noted that the Superintendent of DPW has participated in many early meetings, and is currently reviewing the applications.

Ms. Morelli noted that the Planning Board received a letter from EPOCH and she read it into the record. Ms. Sauve, Administrator at EPOCH, requested that a 4-foot vegetative screen be planted behind 8 Porter Street to provide more privacy. She also requested that the proposed lighting not affect the residents at night. EPOCH expressed full support for the project.

Mr. Cassavoy asked about the light poles. He suggested that all of the proposed lighting needs to be at a pedestrian scale. Attorney McAvoy noted that the lights would not be illuminated all night. Mr. Cassavoy countered, stating that during the winter, the lights would need to be on. He believed that the light poles could be reduced in height.

Mr. Cassavoy stated that the abutters made a good point about acoustics when the structures are demolished on Porter Street. Mr. Bell provided some additional information about the acoustic analysis. Mr. Bell indicated that the sound monitoring was to establish a baseline to estimate the effect of the surface parking lots. He noted that most noise is coming from the rooftop and there are very few obstructions. In the model, the buildings could be taken out, but those sounds do not impact the residences. Mr. Cassavoy asked about the loading dock. Mr. Bell noted that there is some impact from the loading dock. The existing structures do provide some buffer from back up alarms. The intention of the fence is to help mitigate the noise from the loading dock. Mr. Bell estimated a 5 decibel increase during loading dock operations, where a 3 decibel increase is noticeable. It is a relatively small impact. Mr. Cassavoy asked about the emergency generators. Mr. Bell indicated that the emergency generators are already enclosed within a barrier to attenuate noise.

Mr. Welch asked about the effect of traffic noise on residents. There will be open space on Porter Street, and the noise of vehicles starting and stopping at the traffic light could reflect up Porter Street. Mr. Bell indicated that that concern was not studied; however, noise dissipates over distance and the noise wavelengths have too many directions to travel so the impact is negligible.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward asked about the hours of the loading dock. Mr. Kelleher indicated that the first delivery is typically 6 am. Food delivery is made approximately two times a week. Pharmaceutical deliveries are made three times a week. Ms. DeSouza-Ward asked if there was a limit in the evening. It is 5pm. Mr. Kelleher noted that the linen service has the ability to delivery after the loading dock closes if the driver is late.

Mr. Mercado asked what the need is for the surface parking lots if a new garage will be built. Mr. Kelleher indicated that it allows construction of the new garage. Currently, there are 372 spaces in the existing garage. The new garage will be located where there is surface parking currently at the corner of

Lebanon Street and East Emerson Street. Those spaces would be relocated to the existing garage, and employees who park in the existing garage will park in the surface parking lots proposed. Mr. Kelleher noted that the surface parking lots would be permanent, not temporary as some abutters mentioned.

Mr. Mercado asked if offsite parking could be increased. Mr. Kelleher explained that there are 100 parking spaces at the Square One Mall and 80 spaces at Deering Lumber. Increasing the number of spaces that are used offsite is not practicable as many employees travel between Melrose-Wakefield Hospital and Lawrence Memorial Hospital in Medford and it is not efficient for the employee to travel to the offsite lot for access to their vehicle.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward stated that she is not following the number of parking spaces. Mr. Kelleher noted that the zoning requirement is one space per 600 square feet. The new wing will be approximately 288,000 square feet, which will increase the size of the hospital to 408,000 square feet. Ms. DeSouza-Ward noted that the increase in square footage will require an increase of parking spaces. She asked how many parking spaces are proposed in the garage. Mr. Kelleher indicated approximately 550 spaces.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward asked what the hours of operation would be for the surface parking lots. Mr. Kelleher indicated that they would operate primarily 8 am to 5 pm on weekdays. On the weekends, there is enough space on the main campus due to the lower staffing levels. Mr. Kelleher also noted that no one who works late or overnight shifts parks offsite for safety reasons. Ms. DeSouza-Ward noted that the lighting could be limited to those operational hours.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward asked how access would be controlled. The employee's badge would give them access to the parking lots. Mr. Welch asked what mechanism there would be to control access in the future. Attorney McAvoy explained that it could be a condition of a Decision.

Ms. Morelli asked if the consultants had considered the Upper Porter Street lot with the 25-foot residential buffer. Mr. Kelleher stated that it was considered, but was not possible to provide enough parking. Ms. Morelli stated that she would like to see the design. She indicated that she would prefer to minimize any surplus of parking at the end of the master plan. Attorney McAvoy noted that they would reevaluate the parking layout with the required buffer. Ms. Morelli asked what the maximum amount of parking required rather than what is needed. Mr. McAvoy indicated that it is difficult to determine because the parking garage has not yet been designed. Mr. Kelleher indicated that ideally the garage would have one level underground, but the limiting factor is the water table. For comparison purposes, the existing garage is 27,000 square feet.

Mr. Mercado asked about smokers. Mr. Kelleher stated that the property is a no smoking campus, but it is very difficult to police where smokers go in the neighborhood. Mr. Kelleher stated that the intent of the benches was not to create a space for smokers to congregate; rather it is to provide a spot to rest. Ms. Batchelor stated that the benches could be eliminated and more plants added.

Ms. Morelli asked about the history of poor maintenance. She stated that the landscape plan is well thought out. It is lush and multilayered. But what assurances can be provided, as the plan is only as good as the maintenance. Mr. Kelleher stated that the experience on East Emerson Street will not happen again. The trees have been removed and are being replaced with native species. The new trees will be taken care of, and have been planted with enough space to allow them to grow. Ms. Morelli asked if any more landscaping would be provided on East Emerson Street. Mr. Kelleher stated not at this time. Ms. Morelli asked about irrigation. Mr. Kelleher explained that the irrigation along East Emerson Street failed and is being replaced with the same drip irrigation proposed for the parking lots.

Mr. Welch noted that the structure at 775 Main Street does have similarities to the Regan Library. He asked if the Applicant had considered moving Mr. Torraca's practice to that building.

Mr. Mercado asked if queuing would occur on Porter Street at the surface parking lots as employees wait for the gate to open. Mr. Kelleher stated that it could be possible. Mr. Manning indicated that there is some space for vehicles to queue. He also pointed out that the employees who would park in the surface parking lots would be used to the motion of swiping their card and driving through the opened gate.

Mr. Mercado asked if the stormwater chambers were higher or lower than the nearby residences. Ms. Staffier explained that the chambers were located 7 feet below grade, and the nearby residences were not included in the survey. Mr. Mercado asked about the water table. Ms. Staffier explained that a 2-foot separation is required between the water table and the bottom of the chamber.

Mr. Mercado asked about construction routes. Elizabeth Bahnuk, the Director of Facility Planning and Development, indicated that it is unknown at this time. However, since Porter Street is one-way, construction traffic will have to turn right or left onto Rowe Street. These vehicles would likely circle the main campus and exit back to Lebanon Street. Mr. Mercado asked for the construction management plan to be updated.

Mr. Sadowski asked Mr. Manning to address why the Lower Porter Street lot has two curb cuts, but the Upper Porter Street lot has a single curb cut. Mr. Manning explained that it comes down to geometry within the lots. Mr. Sadowski asked what makes the most sense for traffic circulation putting aside maximizing the number of spaces. Mr. Manning indicated that neither operates better than the other. Mr. Manning noted that the curb cut at the Upper Porter Street lot is wider than the standard because of the island needed for the gate. If there was no island, it would be the standard size.

Mr. Sadowski asked why the number of catch basins in the lots is not equal. Ms. Staffier explained that it is a factor of grading.

Mr. Sadowski asked about new curbing. Ms. Staffier stated that it would be pre-cast concrete.

Ms. Morelli asked about the access for Mr. Torraca's practice. Mr. Kelleher indicated that there have been ongoing conversations but currently there is impasse. Mr. Kelleher stated that the office would be constrained and Hallmark Health has allowed the egress from the parking lot to be sensor based. Mr. Kelleher stated that Mr. Torraca prefers having a parking lane and an access lane, which Hallmark Health is considering. The Applicant has also offered snow removal services.

Ms. Morelli stated that the Planning Board provides a non-binding recommendation to the Board of Appeals on the special permits and variances. Attorney McAvoy stated that the Applicant would consider requesting a continuance from the Board of Appeals until after the next Planning Board meeting. Ms. DeSouza-Ward stated that a continuance would be helpful. At this time, she cannot recommend granting the variance from the 25-foot buffer requirement. Attorney McAvoy requested that the Planning Board write a letter to the Board of Appeals supporting the request for a continuance.

Mr. Mercado asked for clarification on the utility plan. It appears that a storm drain dead ends. Ms. Staffier explained that the Applicant installed a manhole and made a connection to the existing system already. These connections were completed so that Lebanon Street and Porter Street would not be dug up after completion of the roadway reconstruction project. Mr. Mercado asked if that is the same with the curb cut. Ms. Staffier explained that it is the same reason why the curb cut has been coordinated with the DOT plans.

Mr. Mercado asked if the Applicant proposes to improve Porter Street. Ms. Staffier indicated that the curbing would be reset and new sidewalks would be installed. At the intersection of Porter Street and Rowe Street, ADA curb ramps will be installed. Mr. Mercado asked if any improvements are proposed for Rowe Street. There are none.

Ms. Morelli went through a list of items that the Applicant should endeavor to address prior to the next meeting. These include:

- The requested additional information on truck routes and parking lot traffic at the completion of the project.
- Identification of snow removal procedures.
- Reevaluate whether the location of the underground storage tanks for stormwater could be moved further from residential structures.
- A circulation solution for the Torraca property.
- Additional information on the transition between the hospital work and the DOT work on Porter Street.
- A solution for the benches that addresses concerns about smokers.
- The height of the proposed lights should be reduced and cut sheets on the light fixtures should be provided.
- Reevaluation of the parking layout with respect to the 25-foot residential buffer.
- The Applicant should consider how to appropriately mitigate for the demolition of the building at 775 Main Street.
- The Applicant should address vehicle queuing at the parking lots.

Mr. Cassavoy asked for more information regarding the principal versus accessory use determination. Attorney McAvoy indicated that the Building Commissioner is currently reviewing and more information will be available later.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward MADE a MOTION to continue the public hearing to October 26, 2015, and to write a letter to the Board of Appeals supporting the Applicant's request for a continuance. Mr. Mercado SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

**NEXT MEETING**

The next Regular Meetings are scheduled for September 28 and October 26, 2015.

The meeting adjourned at 10:50 PM.