

**City of Newburyport  
Planning Board  
November 15, 2017**

The meeting was called to order at 7:03 PM.

**1. Roll Call**

In attendance for the Planning Board: James Brugger, Anne Gardner, Tania Hartford, Joe Lamb, Leah McGavern, Andrew Shapiro, Bonnie Sontag, and Mary Jo Verde

Absent: Don Walters

Andrew Port, Director of Planning and Development, was also present

**2. General Business**

Chair Sontag introduced the Zoning Administrator, Jennifer Blanchette.

***a) NED/Waterfront West Update***

Director Port said Waterfront West joint public meetings would resume after the holidays.

- b)*** The minutes of 11/1/17 were approved as amended. Andrew Shapiro made a motion to approve the minutes. Leah McGavern seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

**Motion Approved.**

*During the course of discussion and consideration of this application, plan(s), supporting material(s), department head comments, peer review report(s), planning department comments and other related documents, all as filed with the planning department as part of this application and all of which are available in the planning department, were considered.*

***a) 223 High Street Lot 1 – Request for lot release***

Chair Sontag said the lot release would be continued because documents were not yet recorded at the registry and there was no confirmation of adequate lot access yet.

Attorney James Kroesser, 254 Bay Road, South Hamilton, requested approval of revised plans. A bulkhead, initially two feet outside the original footprint, had been moved. The front entry, initially outside the original footprint, was corrected resulting in the removal of front entry columns. Composition materials had been submitted and the road was completed.

Leah McGavern made a motion to approve the building plans and elevations for proposed construction of a single-family home on Lot 1, as submitted. Mary Jo Verde seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

Planning Board  
November 15, 2017

Director Port said documents for preservation and conservation restrictions were submitted from property owner David Sabatini today. Given the history errors with the previous owner, the documents needed to be checked against the requirements before the lot could be released. Attorney Kroesser said he would file with the registry once documents were approved. Director Port said a vote of approval could be subject to prior Planning Office review and approval.

Andrew Shapiro made a motion to accept the covenant, preservation restriction, Homeowner's Association documents, and conservation restriction, subject to the review and approval of the Office of Planning & Development, with the stipulation that matters would return to the board for further review if necessary. Anne Gardner seconded the motion and all members in favor.

**Motions Approved.**

*During the course of discussion and consideration of this application, plan(s), supporting material(s), department head comments, peer review report(s), planning department comments and other related documents, all as filed with the planning department as part of this application and all of which are available in the planning department, were considered.*

***b) Application completeness vote – 255R Low Street (2017-SPR-07)***

Director Port said new parking would be built behind the Maritime Medical office building on the last piece of land from the Tropic Star acquisition. He recommended approval.

James Brugger made a motion to deem the application submitted for site plan approval at 255R Low Street complete for the purposes of scheduling a public hearing, such hearing to be held on December 6, 2017. Joe Lamb seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

**Motion Approved.**

*During the course of discussion and consideration of this application, plan(s), supporting material(s), department head comments, peer review report(s), planning department comments and other related documents, all as filed with the planning department as part of this application and all of which are available in the planning department, were considered.*

***c) Request for minor modification – 496 Merrimac Street (2016-SP-07)***

Attorney Mark Griffin said the proposed home in the rear was pulled back 10 feet due to its proximity to wetlands and mature trees. The ZBA and the Conservation Commission approved the change. There were no dimensional or design changes. Chair Sontag asked if the move affected the abutting structures or views? Attorney Griffin said there was no impact.

Joe Lamb made a motion to deem the requested change as a minor modification to the originally approved plans. Tania Hartford seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

Planning Board  
November 15, 2017

Andrew Shapiro made a motion to approve the revised site plan layout and building footprint for the new rear dwelling to be constructed at 496 Merrimac Street, as submitted. Anne Gardner seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

**Motions Approved.**

*During the course of discussion and consideration of this application, plan(s), supporting material(s), department head comments, peer review report(s), planning department comments and other related documents, all as filed with the planning department as part of this application and all of which are available in the planning department, were considered.*

**3. Public Hearings**

- a) New England Development**  
**83 Merrimac Street and 90 Pleasant Street**  
**Definitive Subdivision (2014-DEF-02)**  
**Continued from 11/1/17**

Chair Sontag said this was the garage plan. Members asked if the release of the statutory date was covered as well? Director Port said yes.

Leah McGavern made a motion to grant the applicant's request for a continuance of this public hearing until continue December 6, 2017. James Brugger seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

**Motion Approved.**

*During the course of discussion and consideration of this application, plan(s), supporting material(s), department head comments, peer review report(s), planning department comments and other related documents, all as filed with the planning department as part of this application and all of which are available in the planning department, were considered.*

- b) Evergreen Commons LLC**  
**18 Boyd Drive and 5 Brown Avenue**  
**Definitive Subdivision (2017-DEF-01)**  
**WRPD Special Permit (2017-SP-05)**  
**Continued from 11/1/17**

Attorney Lisa Mead, Mead, Talerma, and Costa, LLC, 30 Green Street, noted that Don Walters's absence would disqualify him from voting. Neil Price, senior hydrogeologist, Horsley Witten (HW), 30 Green Street, said that after reviewing and commenting on initial plans from the applicant, he worked with the Conservation Commission on the main tactical issues of seasonal high groundwater (SHGW) and isolated land subject to flooding (ILSF). The applicant submitted revised materials addressing those issues. The average high groundwater depth observed over a long period of time in the spring (SHGW), was not the highest level recorded

Planning Board  
November 15, 2017

and was usually lower than flood levels. One method of determining SHGW was examining test pits for indications of minerals leeching through the soil. Another method was a comparison to USGS well readings. He had asked the applicant to do both. The two methods were in general agreement with each other. He concurred with the findings. The highest determined floodwater, or ILSF, was ascertained through observation or modeling. The applicant initially used modeling. HW had recommended the applicant use observational and surveyed data. The Mother's Day Flood level at 56.2 feet was less than the high water mark of the 100-year storm. Site grading was altered. HW ran the model at 8.3 inches and came up with a proposed top elevation of 55.25 feet. The land use conveyed more water, but it all fit. It was important not to take credit for the SHGW. The mark between SHGW and the 100-year flood was the space that would get filled. There was another ILSF closer to the City wells that were impacted heavily by the pumping levels. No accurate, direct comparison between the City wells and the test pits existed. The change in land use from golf course to OSRD, with appropriate stormwater and sewer engineering, was beneficial because here would be less pollution loading.

Members asked if the OSRD was still a better use accounting for potential for pollution in light of the tight restrictions on the golf course? Mr. Price said there were also restrictions on homeowners. An OSRD was still a better use, however, it was in the City's hands to determine whether the Homeowner's Association (HOA) restrictions were the best fit for the situation. Chair Sontag asked if questions of mismatched plans were resolved? Mr. Price said not yet. Mr. Sawyer said he waited on the groundwater issue before finalizing plans. Everything would be incorporated, along with Phil Christiansen's comments. Updated plans would be submitted tomorrow. Attorney Mead said the Conservation Commission requested incorporating the annual turf management review into the HOA document, with a limited time for review, before it was submitted to the City. The applicant agreed.

Public comment open.

Ann Marie Vega, 21 Boyd Drive, asked if the timing of groundwater mounding related to the flooding of Boyd Drive homes? If development foundations had to be 56.25 feet, how much higher should foundations be on existing Boyd Drive homes? Attorney Mead said Mr. Sawyer's topography and elevation changes showed Boyd Drive elevations compared to the golf course.

Mr. Sawyer showed on the plan a large paved area that was part of the original stormwater calculations. He raised the elevation by three feet or so because stormwater on the street could not be increased. He demonstrated on the plan where a collecting and closed drainage system directed water away from Boyd Drive and ended in a small pond. The discharge pipe was higher. Water that previously entered the ground would be conveyed to the rear of the property. Boyd Drive was at an elevation of 61 feet. Today's elevation was 59-60.

Ms. Vega said her house was lower. She worried, in the event it would not work. Mr. Price said he would review that issue when he received revised plans. Mr. Sawyer said there had been multiple peer reviews examining his work on the issue. The mounding was in reference to the ILSF. Mounding on City property was isolated from the site by the bedrock high. Experts concluded that water was limited from flowing away by the bedrock high, producing the

Planning Board  
November 15, 2017

mounding. The stormwater systems would not prevent mounding from occurring, but the total water balance of the site was not changing. The development did not bring in more water.

Ms. Vega said the HOA needed to submit reports to the Water Department, but there was no penalty for failure to submit. How would the submission be ensured unless the board wrote it into the decision? Chair Sontag asked Mr. Price to take that into consideration.

Jeanette Isabella, 1 Lime Street, asked if the City hired an expert to verify the findings? Chair Sontag said Mr. Price was the City's expert. Ms. Isabella asked if Philips Drive would be affected by the stormwater design? Chair Sontag said Philips Drive was not part of the project. Jay Billings, Northeast Geoscience, 97 Walnut Street, Clinton, MA, said roof leaders directed to infiltration trenches in the form of small rain gardens and some small dry wells would address water from increased impervious areas. Two peer review engineers had reviewed calculations.

Jane Snow, 9 Coffin Street, said the golf course was no longer active and had not been fertilized in a long time. Were there records showing how many chemicals were used when the course was active? Mr. Billings said the golf course was currently active. Records of all chemicals used since 2014 were compiled and soil testing performed. Mr. Price had a list of products purchased and used by the course since August 2016.

Peter Hatcher, 15 Boyd Drive, said the new site proposed to dig a ditch to expose groundwater. Would that make the groundwater more likely to be polluted? Mr. Price said there would be an expanded buffer to catch pollutants before they reached the water. Mr. Hatcher asked if the new design was safer? Mr. Price said yes.

Public comments closed.

Member comments: Would a larger pond of standing water attract bugs in the summer and require more pesticide use? Attorney Mead said because the wetland was active in summer, organics would be brought in to help plants survive in wetlands. Mr. Price said a properly functioning wetland needed mosquitos. The new system should be better than that. A condition should be added that no pesticides could be sprayed. Members asked if Mr. Price would drink this water? Mr. Price said the proposed was an improvement over current conditions.

Chair Sontag said after additional input from HW and more dialogue with the applicant a decision would be drafted for a vote. Director Port said when HW's review and report were completed those findings would be included in the decision. Members would also review the HOA documents. He did not receive any feedback after first notifying the Water & Sewer Commission in the spring. He let them know their comments would be appreciated at their meeting this evening. The Conservation Commission did the same. Chair Sontag said Director Port had recommend including formal responses from the Conservation Commission, Water Department, and Water & Sewer Commission in the board's decision. Members wanted to formalize the request for a letter of final review before making a decision. Attorney Mead said the Board of Health provided formal input in July, approving the subdivision and WRPD special permit. The Water & Sewer Commission's next meeting was December 13. The ordinance required a response within 60 days of the filing, which was in May. Director Port had provided

Planning Board  
November 15, 2017

them with the HW report and said all parties should look at the conditions. Attorney Mead said the Planning Office and the Conservation Commission had given multiple rounds of feedback on the HOA documents. She requested a timely draft decision. Chair Sontag said a decision would not be drafted prior to the final HW report and the Water & Sewer Commission review. The first review would be on December 20. Materials were needed for review at least a week in advance.

Leah McGavern made a motion to grant the applicant's request for a continuance of the public hearing to December 20, 2017. James Brugger seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

**Motion Approved.**

*During the course of discussion and consideration of this application, plan(s), supporting material(s), department head comments, peer review report(s), planning department comments and other related documents, all as filed with the planning department as part of this application and all of which are available in the planning department, were considered.*

- c) Newburyport Manager, LLC**  
**Brown's Wharf, 58 McKay's Wharf, 72 Merrimac Street**  
**Definitive Subdivision (2017-DEF-02)**  
**Continued from 11/1/17**

Mary Jo Verde made a motion to grant the applicant's request for a continuance of this public hearing until December 6, 2017. Joe Lamb seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

**Motion Approved.**

*During the course of discussion and consideration of this application, plan(s), supporting material(s), department head comments, peer review report(s), planning department comments and other related documents, all as filed with the planning department as part of this application and all of which are available in the planning department, were considered.*

- d) Parker 2 Realty Trust**  
**2 Parker Street and 151-155 State Street**  
**Definitive Subdivision (2017-DEF-04)**  
**Major Site Plan Review (2017-SPR-06)**  
**VI.C Special Permit (2017-SP-07)**  
**Continued from 10/18/17**

Attorney Mead, representing Joe and Ed Hill, principals, Parker 2 Realty Trust, said the project was in B1 and R2 districts. She presented plans that were undergoing a Conservation Commission review that required one more meeting. Permits for a two-family use in the R2 and for a multi-family use in the B3 district were granted. She received a variance for a multi-family. The project started with in a tech review meeting with the City in April when it was unknown where the bike path would be. The applicant put \$50,000 toward construction of the path. After the filing, the City decided to locate the path along Parker Street, entirely changing the

Planning Board  
November 15, 2017

stormwater on the site and requiring a redesign. The lot included 23 units on 96,000 square feet of land. They did not use the multi-family density bonus, keeping with what fit on the site as it existed, instead. The resource area was not on site because there was a pond in the rear, but the buffer was on site, which was the reason they were before the Conservation Commission.

Engineer Chad Branon, Fieldstone Land Consultants, 206 Elm Street, Milford, NH, reviewed pedestrian and vehicular access, utilities, drainage, landscaping, and erosion control. The multi-family condo development on 2.07 acres was designed to be sensitive to the resource areas. Plans addressed comments from the fire, water, and planning departments. A 22-foot wide roadway met the definition of a court because the condo development was one lot. The fire department required Hines Way to be 20 feet. Derrick's Path was 16 feet wide and serviced three units. Both roads were curbed with vertical sloped granite. A five-foot concrete sidewalk was on the west side of Hines Way. The east side had a mailbox kiosk with a pull off, two visitor parking spots, and a bike rack. The project, serviced by municipal water and sewer, would install an 8-inch water main on the west side of Hines Way and two hydrants whose locations, along with 'No Parking' signage, were specified by the fire department. The pump station would tie into the existing force main servicing the project. Electric and cable were underground.

Stormwater management had changed substantially for the space changing 10-foot wide intermodal path. The redesign was undertaken collaboratively with the City engineer. Runoff from the front of units # 6-17 on the north side was captured through a closed drainage system with deep sump catch basins conveyed toward Derrick's Path to an infiltration CULTEC system. A rain garden on the west side of Derrick's Path captured runoff from the backside of units # 6-17. The topography rose up from Parker Street. Runoff from the southern portion would be collected through another closed drainage system running south down Hines Way into a subsurface tech system. Runoff was directed to good sand on the west side of the site. A small swale went to a rain garden off unit #1 and tied into the nearby chamber system. Another north-to-south closed drainage system ran under the intermodal path. A drainage manhole connected with a short section of pipe for water quality and swale drainage. Two catch basins were at the low point of the Hines Way entrance. More catch basins were on the Parker Street side to catch today's runoff. Another catch basin on the east side tied into the closed system. There was no negative impact on groundwater quality. All City regulations and stormwater guidelines were met. CSI's review letter arrived November 9. The majority of comments had been addressed. He anticipated resubmitting to CSI tomorrow.

Mr. Branon had specs from the City for the 280 feet long intermodal path. The site entrance was constructed of concrete to driveway specifications. The 10-foot, downcast, pole-mounted LED lights met residential grade lighting standards, not parking lot lighting. Landscaping was significant with objectives of providing a residential feel, blending with the natural surroundings, and providing good buffering elements. Landscaped areas were in front of the units, along Hines Way, at the intersection of Derrick's Path and Hines Way, and in the cul de sac interior that featured a walking path and flagpole. He was working with the Conservation Commission on drainage improvements, including additional landscaping inside the 100-foot buffer zone and a white vinyl stockade fence to help with buffers. Attorney Mead showed renderings.

Member comments: Sidewalks on the right and visitor parking on the left? Mr. Branon said yes, there were 'No Parking' signs on east side of Hines Way and along Derrick's Path, but there was

Planning Board  
November 15, 2017

parking along the cul de sac, the west side of Hines Way, and two parking spaces for each unit. The City asked for street trees at least 10 feet off the curb. The site line exceeded requirements. Did the intermodal path cover the property boundaries? Mr. Branon said the path extended to the closest driveway on the west and the end of the property to the east. Did the developer contemplate an entire plan with ANR approvals? Attorney Mead said no, the applicant did not own enough property at the time to do that. Were there renderings of the front units? Mr. Branon said no, but front units had the exact same architecture and landscaping that tied in with the rest of the development. Attorney Mead said the new units were a smaller at little over 2,000 square feet. Was the road privately maintained? Attorney Mead said yes. Was the sewer grind and pump station above ground? Mr. Branon said no. The current above ground pump station would be replaced and put underground. Did units in back have decks or walk out basements? Mr. Branon said the 'at grade' design provided space for usable deck areas. Was there a retaining wall? Mr. Branon said Hines Way came off the road at 2% and transitioned to just over 4%. A proposed block retaining wall with a fieldstone façade on the west side of the project addressed a knob in the topography and provided ample backyard for those units. Were there set back issues? Mr. Branon said no. What about snow storage? Mr. Branon said the Conservation Commission was addressing snow storage now. There was some storage in two locations off Derrick's Path in the rear and on one side of the cul de sac. Closed drainage would also offer snowmelt drainage. Were sidewalks on both sides considered? Mr. Branon said, typically, he would with a through road. The road was safe for residents to cross to reach the sidewalk. There was less impervious area without sidewalks on both sides.

Chair Sontag said a court accessed only three or four units. Attorney Mead said the subdivision regulations were different. A court served no more than two lots. One lot was being created in the back. The two lots in front accessed Parker Street directly, but the Conservation Commission did not want two additional curb cuts. CSI asked about this in their review. Did each condo have one garage spot? Attorney Mead said yes, plus one driveway spot. Chair Sontag asked for a definition of a closed drainage system? Mr. Branon said he used low impact development techniques, but it was hard with the road design. A closed system described the catch basins along the curb line with a pipe system to convey runoff to the infiltration chambers. The StormTech systems had an Isolator Row, the first chamber in the system, which took on the water quality volume and accepted a sediment load in two locations. There was a net reduction in runoff for the site. Infiltration basins sent everything into the ground. Attorney Mead said the Conservation Commission was worried about the health of the pond in back. Some water was directed to the pond to keep it healthy. Mr. Branon said the subsurface system created less impact on the surface for more usable yard space. Was driveway parking meant to keep cars from obstructing the road? Mr. Branon said yes.

Attorney Mead said a 'by right' plan was in the packet. Two two-bedroom affordable units and one three-bedroom affordable unit for sale were includable for the DHI with a long-term deed restriction in perpetuity that met Section VI.C special permit (SP) requirements. The intermodal infrastructure would be constructed for \$100,000 per linear foot. She reviewed other VI.C SP requirements. A variance for use allowed two three-unit buildings. The area was zoned for residential use. No other developable land was there. The Smart Growth district was adjacent.



Planning Board  
November 15, 2017

Dan Mills, principal traffic engineer, MDM Transportation, 28 Lord Road, Marlborough, said the original study was for 31 total units. Trip generation and findings were generally the same. Parker Street carried 5,000 vehicles a day. Morning peak hours had 12 trips, the majority exiting. Evening peak hours had 14 trips, with cars returning. There was a .5 or 1 % impact on the roadway with low additional traffic on Parker Street. The development had no material traffic impact. Members said people biking on the intermodal pathway would cross the private road. Mr. Mills said site lines were adequate for speeds of 35-40 mph. Attorney Mead said there was a transition from concrete to asphalt as cars exited the site to indicate a driveway entrance. Members asked if there was a buffer between the trail and the road? Director Port said there would be a few feet of grass. Chair Sontag asked if the standards were adjusted for density? Mr. Mills said no, because it would not make a difference in the analysis. Chair Sontag asked if exiting cars would get backed up? Mr. Mills said there was an 'A' level of service at Parker Street and 'D' or better at State Street. Most traffic onto State Street would turn right. Chair Sontag thought there should be consideration for the intersection at Parker and State Streets. Members said the intersection was already bad. Attorney Mead said it was rated 'D' before the development. Mr. Mills said the City had already engaged the state to improve the whole area because the rotary was overdesigned. Mr. Branon said Mr. Mills used the appropriate land use code for accurate results regarding the density and traffic impact.

Attorney Mead reviewed the SP criteria. The Water & Sewer Department said all City systems could support the development's 15 two-bedroom units and eight three-bedroom units consistent with R2 and B1 zoning. A new sewer line was installed already. Although there was a waiver request for the environmental and community impact analysis, a study was submitted showing the project could produce five additional students, at most. The Conservation Commission wanted more plantings in back, where the applicant would clean up trash and install a fence to keep abutters from impacting the wetlands. Members asked the price of market rate and affordable units? Attorney Mead said the Towle project's affordable two-bedrooms went for \$280,000. Market rate was \$6-680,000. The project met the 10% affordability threshold.

Member comments: Director Port said the adjacent 40R was 25% affordability. Members said the SP was discretionary. Consider extending the bike path or reduced incomes for the affordable units. Attorney Mead said they were building the bike path on the property for the cost of a unit, a contribution in excess of any other V.I.C. SP. Members said the project was larger than any other V.I.C. The applicant would spend five times as much as the \$50,000 originally offered for the intermodal path. Members asked if the estimate on construction would be based on the prevailing wage? Director Port said construction was not subject to that because it was not a municipal project and would pay less. Attorney Mead said the intermodal path was not only 10 feet of pavement, but also the underground infrastructure for drainage with a lot of carry over costs. Chair Sontag asked whether drainage construction costs would have to be included if the path extended to the cemetery? Mr. Branon said the ditch petered out as topography changed along the roadway. The cemetery's fence was in the right-of-way, it was necessary to stay on the backside of the utility poles, and grading was needed. Details would have to be worked out to fit the path, but it would not be the same extent of drainage required in front. Members asked what the path connected to? Attorney Mead said it connected to the back of March's Hill. Director Port gave more details of the entire placement of the new path. Extending the path in the area that was essentially grass so it would not dead end suddenly at a driveway would be a benefit to

Planning Board  
November 15, 2017

everyone. Although outside the 40R, it was quite large. Members considered that buildings looked the same, but did not take issue. The area, deliberately omitted from the 40R for a transition area from dense to lesser density, was meant to be less dense. As proposed, there should be a higher affordability percentage, in numbers and/or affordability. However, the 13% affordability exceeded the 10% threshold. Lowering the AMI requirements could be beneficial.

Public comment open.

Tom Kolterjahn, 64 Federal Street, was concerned about cars crossing the rail trail and ways to make it safer. He preferred the opinion of a City attorney on the court issue.

Chair Sontag read from the regulation. There was no question about how it was written. Members said the red responses on that section of the application confirmed the applicant's attorney's response. Attorney Mead said CSI also addressed the issue.

Steve Jayne, 2 Melvin Court, said the development was an improvement to that parcel of land.

Public comment closed.

Anne Gardner made a motion to grant the applicant's request for a continuance of this public hearing until December 6, 2017. Joe Lamb seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

**Motion Approved.**

*During the course of discussion and consideration of this application, plan(s), supporting material(s), department head comments, peer review report(s), planning department comments and other related documents, all as filed with the planning department as part of this application and all of which are available in the planning department, were considered.*

***e) Newburyport Renovations, LLC c/o Lisa Mead  
43 Liberty Street  
DOD Special Permit (2017-SP-09)***

Director Port said the submission requirement to file with the Newburyport Historical Commission (NHC) was missed. Attorney Mead said that DOD SP requirements were not triggered. Director Port asked if a DOD SP was needed? Attorney Mead said the building inspector had said a Section IX modification to a pre-existing non-conforming structure SP was needed for the addition. The board was the special permit granting authority (SPGA) in the DOD. Director Port said the SP trigger was that it was a contributing structure in the DOD. Chair Sontag said changes to the exterior meant the board needed NHC input. Members asked whether the zoning administrator could look at it?

Attorney Mead showed a plan of the William Dodge Greek Revival home listed as contributory and one of the few residential single-family homes downtown in the B3 DOD. It was non-conforming for just about everything. There were no new non-conformities. The lot coverage

Planning Board  
November 15, 2017

extended a bit by demolishing 10.27 % of the exterior walls for a modest addition that increased square footage from 1,105 to just over 1200.

Architect Scott Brown, 29 Water Street, said the worker's cottage, in a slight state of disrepair and vinyl sided, had been stripped of its original windows, crown moldings, and front entry surround a long time ago. He proposed a high quality project. The left side addition, adjacent to a two-car tandem parking space, was set back from the front with a new covered entry. Roof pitches matched. The addition was no higher than the existing ridge. Another addition on the back enveloped an existing one-story porch, the only section proposed to be demolished. He distributed elevations and renderings. At the request of an abutter, windows on the right side would be removed. Attorney Mead said the added roofline gutters would infiltrate stormwater. She distributed letters of support from neighbors. The design was sensitive to the size of neighboring structures. She requested a Section IX SP.

Members wanted to hear from the NHC.

Public comment open.

Gloria Poirier, 2 Liberty Street, said the back addition was one foot nine inches away at the closest point and three feet away at the furthest point. The developer would correct her flooding due to the property's overflow, but too much house was being squeezed onto the lot.

Stephanie Niketic, 93 High Street, said the modest addition on a 1,000 square foot home increased the mass by 50%. That was a large change on a small lot. Many smaller, historic homes were being enlarged resulting in a loss of modest, historic homes. She supported seeking comments from the NHC.

Jeanette Isabella, 1 Lime Street, agreed with both comments.

Public comment closed.

Member comments: Would this trigger the sidewalk repair ordinance? Director Port said no, because a unit was not being added. The sidewalk ordinance was evaluated only in the building department. Developer George Hazeltine, 8 Boardman Street, offered to repair the sidewalk for the two-bedroom home. What would go in the addition? Mr. Brown said a laundry room, a back entry, a mudroom, more kitchen space, extra master bedroom space, and a second bathroom. The proposed addition on the back would go no closer to the lot lines than the existing one-story porch. The additions were not closer to abutters. Water from gutters would go to a drywell on the property. Attorney Mead said in a similar situation on Lime Street, approved by ZBA, the neighbor's flooding issues were alleviated. Mr. Hazeltine said the house would use cedar clapboard and hardy, non-combustible siding.

Andrew Shapiro made a motion to grant the applicant's request for a continuance of this public hearing to December 20, 2017. Mary Jo Verde seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

**Motion Approved.**

*During the course of discussion and consideration of this application, plan(s), supporting material(s), department head comments, peer review report(s), planning department comments and other related documents, all as filed with the planning department as part of this application and all of which are available in the planning department, were considered.*

**4. Planning Office/Subcommittees/Discussion**

***a) Master Plan Update***

Chair Sontag noted the importance of the Master Plan for grant funding. There was no implementation plan as a result of its removal from Chapter 14. Director Port said the only change was in the work plan. A new 11 x 14 format in Chapter 14 named the boards and departments responsible for stated actions, as well as listed potential funding sources. Members asked if edits matched the spirit of the Plan? Director Port said yes. Architectural design standards were important for the ZBA, which had no references, nor enough criteria, to explain to applicants why a proposal was not good enough. The priority going forward was a strong emphasis on higher quality design, architectural standards, and processes.

Anne Gardner made a motion to adopt the final 2017 Master Plan update, as previously prepared and distributed by the Office of Planning & Development and Community Opportunities Group, Inc., a copy of which shall be posted on the City Website and remain on file with the City Clerk and Office of Planning & Development. And further, that said 2017 Master Plan shall replace and supersede the 2001 Master Plan as a guidance document for the development and operations of this City for the next 10 years and until such time as the City drafts a new comprehensive City-wide Master Plan. Said plan may be updated and amended from time to time, as the needs of the City evolve. It is the recommendation of this board that all City boards, departments, and agencies work cooperatively to implement the recommendations of this plan to achieve the vision, goals, and objectives contained therein, and to recommend adoption by the City Council. Leah McGavern seconded the motion and seven members voted in favor. Tania Hartford abstained.

**Motion Approved.**

*During the course of discussion and consideration of this application, plan(s), supporting material(s), department head comments, peer review report(s), planning department comments and other related documents, all as filed with the planning department as part of this application and all of which are available in the planning department, were considered.*

***b) Complete Streets Policy***

City Council met on the policy last night. The goal was to codify what the City already did. Complete Streets could not be incorporated into every project, such as a reconfiguration that

Planning Board  
November 15, 2017

included wetlands constraints or when the cost was disproportionate to the benefit. Director Port asked for a continuance to December 20.

Andrew Shapiro made a motion to continue the Complete Streets Policy to December 20, 2017. James Brugger seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

**Motion Approved.**

*During the course of discussion and consideration of this application, plan(s), supporting material(s), department head comments, peer review report(s), planning department comments and other related documents, all as filed with the planning department as part of this application and all of which are available in the planning department, were considered.*

**c) Other Updates**

Director Port reminded the board that the December 6 meeting would begin at 6:00 PM.

**4. Adjournment**

James Brugger made a motion to adjourn. Mary Jo Verde seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 10:48 PM.

Respectfully submitted -- Linda Guthrie