

**City of Newburyport  
Planning Board  
December 20, 2017**

The meeting was called to order at 7:04 PM.

**1. Roll Call**

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

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

**2. General Business**

- a) The minutes of 12/6/17 were approved as amended. Don Walters made a motion to approve the minutes. Andrew Shapiro 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) 11 Center Street (2016-SP-04) – request for minor modification***

Attorney Mark Griffin, Finneran & Nicholson, P.C., 30 Green Street, distributed his letter of support and cited condition #10 language requiring changes to elements affected by the Newburyport Historical Commission (NHC) Advisory Report to go back before the NHC and the board. Proposed changes did not affect any items on the NHC report. Aileen Graf, Graf Architects, 2 Liberty Street, distributed modified and original drawings. Two windows facing the parking lot were removed, the back sunroom turned into a covered porch, bedroom #3's balcony was removed, the French door replaced with a double-hung 6/6 window to match the other windows, and a 4.5 inch foundation jog was eliminated. An existing skylight shown on the side elevation would remain. Members said embellishments were being removed. Two members considered the changes to be a major modification due to the location of the house. Chair Sontag said an updated NHC Advisory Report was needed before an approval vote could occur.

Andrew Shapiro made a motion to deem the application submitted a minor modification. Leah McGavern seconded the motion and eight members voted in favor. Don Walters voted against.

Attorney Griffin said returning to the NHC was not necessary. Chair Sontag said it was standard procedure for a modification to a special permit that changed the plans. She did not know how condition #10 came about. Attorney Griffin said the NHC wrote condition #10 language that indicating a one-step process because the advisory report did not concern the addition. Chair

Sontag said the board would follow precedent with a two-step process and render a decision upon the applicant's return. Members said the entire structure was important, regardless of the type of modification, because it was a very old building in the DOD. The public hearing was continued to January 17, 2018.

**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) 92R Merrimac Street (2017-SPR-05) – application completeness vote, informal discussion, and recommendations to ZBA***

Informal discussion had taken place already. Director Port would set a date for the subcommittee to determine a recommendation for the ZBA. Chair Sontag recommended the board take no action on the completeness vote.

**3. Public Hearings**

***a) Evergreen Commons LLC  
18 Boyd Drive and 5 Brown Avenue  
Definitive Subdivision (2017-DEF-01)  
WRPD Special Permit (2017-SP-05)  
Continued from 11/15/17***

Chair Sontag said the working session would examine the Horsley Witten (HW) review results and recommended conditions. Outstanding issues remained for other boards and commissions. Director Port distributed a working draft of findings and conditions with the original special permit attached. The Water & Sewer Commission previously would not comment until a final plan was available and should be given another opportunity for feedback. CSI's letter late today said plans complied with the original OSRD and made additional minor comments. Tonight's focus should be on the WRPD SP and incorporating additional conditions to protect the public water supply. Draft findings and conditions incorporated both the Definitive Subdivision and WRPD SP decisions. Chair Sontag said the Water & Sewer Commission, per Chair John Tomasz, agreed that any approval should include items noted in Section B of the December 11, 2017 HW report and all special conditions from the board's March 1, 2017 SP findings and conditions for the OSRD.

Attorney Lisa Mead, Mead, Talerman, and Costa, LLC, 30 Green Street, said three issues from last night's Conservation Commission meeting required board input: 1) demarcation between lots and open space; 2) type of monumentation; and 3) signage, both educational and for open space. She would propose a signage plan for the board's approval to avoid littering the area with signs. The quality of the Conservation Restriction (CR) was discussed also. The CR did not

Planning Board  
December 20, 2017

require an Energy and Environmental Affairs (EEA) approval but could not be in perpetuity as requested by the Conservation Commission, without an EEA sign off. Best efforts would be made, otherwise, the local Conservation Commission would sign off. Timing for certain things in the draft decision was important overall. The CR had to be filed before the first building permit was issued. There was a lot to be done. Open space should not be deeded to the HOA until all work was done, or before the first building permit was issued. But work needed to continue after the CR was issued. The Conservation Commission tightened up HOA documents last night. A plaque in the garage by the door to the house would state that the property owner is subject to an HOA, that there is one landscape contractor, and that there are certain lawn products that are not permitted for use in the subdivision. Chair Sontag said the board would use the draft documents as a checklist for issues covered in last night's Conservation Commission meeting.

Engineer Steve Sawyer, DCI, 68 Pleasant Street, reviewed minor changes on the CR use plan. The wooded area was not to be disturbed, the ILSF area was added to the open space plan, some foundations changed, drywells were updated, and typos corrected. Plans had not changed much since May. He would wait for CSI comments before issuing final Mylars. 'No Parking' signs would be installed, as well as demarcations in the back of lots. Chair Sontag verified with Mr. Sawyer that three foundations HW identified had been corrected.

Neal Price, senior hydrogeologist, HW, 30 Green Street, concurred with Mr. Sawyer. The ILSF, SHGW, and pollutant loading potential were all acceptable. He added approval conditions, also added to HOA documents, regarding mosquitos, pesticides use, and pool water, which could not be drained into the ground when performing maintenance. The Conservation Commission had decided against a pool water condition. Jay Billings, Northeast Geoscience (NGI), 97 Walnut Street, Clinton, explained that backwashing pool filters discharged pool water with chemicals designed for ingestion and were not too toxic. There were no related WRPD restrictions. Mr. Price said chlorine reacts with the organic matter in soil to produce restricted compounds that could get into drinking water. His WRPD condition tried to minimize that effect, but it was a minor concern relative to the chlorinating process. Members were uncomfortable with the pool water risk because water entered the system untreated. Julia Godtfredsen, Newburyport Conservation Administrator, said the commission did not have the benefit of Mr. Price's knowledge at their meeting. When it was initially thought pools should not be allowed, Mr. Billings explained that pool chemicals were benign. The risk of a chemical interaction with the organic matter in soil was not part of the commission's review.

Chair Sontag asked if all pool water had to be hauled offsite if the condition was included? Director Port said yes, pool water was not permitted in the sewer system. Ms. Godtfredsen said pool draining occurred when backwashing filters or lowering levels at the end of the season. Both processes released chemicals into the ground. Attorney Mead said a condition, such as requiring non-chlorine pools, could be added. Ms. Godtfredsen said some filters did not require backwashing. She would find best practices. Members said blow up pools that came as a kit with filters and chemicals included were breakable. Attorney Mead said homeowner's ability to build in ground pools was hampered by the low percentage of impervious surface that could be added. Members said that would encourage the use of blow up pools. Director Port said chemicals in use could change over time. He would not rely on full compliance with a condition that required homeowner's to haul substances off site. Attorney Mead said homeowners could not do

Planning Board  
December 20, 2017

numerous things already. Mr. Billings asked Mr. Price if he knew of other towns with similar pool water and chemical restrictions? A bigger issue was the Water Department's chlorination. It seemed unlikely that a pool located 1,000 feet from the well could affect the drinking water. The condition was overly conservative. Chair Sontag said Mr. Billings was not considering all the other factors that made the site unique, other than untreated water going into the system. Mr. Billings said everyone in Zone II should be held to the same standard, including pools on Boyd Drive and Brown Avenue. The City would be testing for trihalomethanes. Chair Sontag reiterated the expert opinions that the issue was minor and could be controlled through testing. Members said if testing found trihalomethanes, it was too late. Attorney Mead showed a satellite image of several pools on Boyd Drive and two on Brown Avenue, identified the stormwater pipe that drained untreated into Zone I. She said there was no evidence that restrictions were needed.

Members said the existence of neighboring pools did not mean the same privilege had to be extended to Evergreen homes. Justifications would not be based on neighboring pools. Many of the 38 homes could add pools over time. Would that increase the odds for having a problem? Mustard and black algae in pools were chemically treated. The board could avoid perpetuating the risk. Each lot's distance from the well should be evaluated as to risk. Attorney Mead would work with Mr. Price to develop parameters for revising the pool condition. Mr. Price said language for two conditions added to the HOA documents implied they were prohibitions for everyone in a WRPD, rather than conditions for this development only. Attorney Mead would correct that and said the applicant's response to the HW report had resolved everything. Conditions were added for monitoring wetlands and for wetlands to be built and planted in a manner that ensured plant survival, per the Conservation Commission.

Tom Hughes, Hughes Environmental Consulting, 44 Merrimac Street, responded to conditions in Section B where conditions scattered throughout the report had all been put into one section. Well monitoring would be monthly, or more frequently, with or without the condition. He agreed to over site by a wetland scientist and to replacing dead or dying containerized plants for two years. The 300 tubelings that provided after-growth for fuller coverage were, like seed, not all expected to survive and would not be replaced. A requirement that work within the wetland occur during the winter impeded getting ILSF work done right away. He had only seen gophers that were hunted by hawks and recommended phasing the disturbance to allow animals a chance to relocate. He had suggested an alternative to the conditions for working within the resource areas that were agreed to by HW and the Conservation Commission. The alternative gave him flexibility and created a stable site. He would not put anything on the slopes that could wash into the wetlands. The commission wanted signs big enough for homeowners to see. That would result in fairly large signs. Attorney Mead would accept a condition to submit a signage plan for approval that addressed language, location, size, and incorporated educational signs. There would be funding for an annual report by a qualified person on the conservation areas to manage encroachment issues. Mr. Hughes agreed to the remaining conditions.

Attorney Mead addressed issues on the draft of the Definitive Subdivision and WRPD SP decision. Sections had broad titles such as 'Occupancy Permits.' Some items listed were not appropriate at the beginning. The applicant was willing to have the City hold a CR to be recorded when the conservation area was completed or, alternatively, to not record the CR until issuance of the last occupancy permit. The open space should not be deeded until work on the

Planning Board  
December 20, 2017

conservation area was complete. Chair Sontag asked if the timing issue was only on the CR? Attorney Mead said no. Timing related to the SP and Definitive Subdivision also. Ms. Godtfredsen said homes built one-by-one, by a new builder as each home sold, would affect when the commission needed the 'as built' plan. Chip Hall, a development principal, said interim 'as built' plans would be used to release the bonding. A certain number of homes would be built on spec. When sales provided sufficient funding, additional homes would be built. Final 'as built' plans would be held until everything was completed and released for recording.

Members did not want the subdivision division conditions looked at in isolation from the WRPD conditions. Everything that protected the City's water supply should be completed before any home was built, including grading and other similar processes, because of the WRPD. Attorney Mead agreed and would address that in a sequencing plan. Mr. Hughes said permits needed to be included in the final pollution prevention plan. Members said the first occupancy permits would be released when the City was sure the water supply was protected. Attorney Mead said refinements in the working draft would address that. Easements and deeds in the conditions under 'Prior to Release of Lots' would not get transferred until the very end to avoid insurance and indemnification issues. Director Port would follow up with the applicant offline to develop a timeline and return to the board with a marked up version that protected the City.

Attorney Mead said outstanding commission items had all been addressed except the demarcation on lot's back corners. Director Port said a physical marker was important for determining the public right of way, private property, and open space areas. Ms. Godtfredsen said the commission recommended split rail fences to prevent mowing into the conservation area. Attorney Mead said residents would not mow their own lawns. One maintenance person would do everything, including winterizing driveways. Ms. Godtfredsen said no language expressly prohibited homeowners from performing maintenance. Director Port said the provision for a single, licensed lawn care professional to establish a unified program for lot maintenance was on page 12 in the original OSRD SP. Attorney Mead said HW added the provision to the HOA documents. Director Port said draft conditions concerning the HOA documents addressed the provision as well. Attorney Mead would add a provision that homeowners could not perform specific maintenance on their property. Members said the OSRD disallowed privacy fencing between the front of the house and the street. Attorney Mead said granite bounds were fairly permanent. A split rail fence was easy to move around. Chair Sontag said yearly monitoring would catch whether a fence had moved. Members preferred granite bounds. The construction monitor would catch erroneous mowing. Director Port said CSI would visit the site as needed.

Members asked if there would be weekly reports? Director Port said monitoring was 'as needed.' Weekly could be specified. Attorney Mead said all major milestones would be reviewed. Members noted that Mr. Christiansen's letter was not typical. A portion of the letter regarding daily inspections to protect the City's water supply was read aloud. Should a condition be added for a representative to be on site full time during infrastructure construction? Mr. Sawyer said it was unusual for Mr. Christiansen to comment on daily inspections, which was overkill. Chair Sontag said the letter's subsequent paragraph explained that Mr. Christiansen was guarding against past errors of inappropriate fill or something similar, from occurring in the future. Members accepted weekly monitoring due to the expense of a daily report. Did the commission

Planning Board  
December 20, 2017

require weekly wetlands monitoring? Ms. Godtfredsen said monitoring would be for two years, but not weekly during construction. A wetlands scientist would oversee construction.

Public comment open.

Peter Hatcher 15 Boyd Drive, asked who maintained the open space if it was deeded to the City? Attorney Mead said it was not deeded to the City, but was public land. Maintenance was paid for and performed by the HOA. Mr. Hatcher asked how homes with so many restrictions were marketable? Director Port said the restrictions necessarily protected the water supply from salts, chemicals, and landscaping pesticides.

Ann Marie Vega, 21 Boyd Drive, said Cherry Hill's pool restrictions, that were under fire, were an example of pool restrictions that could be examined for that was workable or not.

Rick Vega, 21 Boyd Drive, said a pool had to have a fence. Chair Sontag said that was a different type of fencing than one that delineated the yard from the conservation area.

Public comment closed.

Chair Sontag said there was only part of January to get issues clarified. Members asked if any experts would be involved in the review? Director Port said yes, by legal counsel as well as the Public Services Water and Sewer Divisions' feedback. The Planning Office would finalize conditions without the Water and Sewer Commission's feedback, if necessary. Chair Sontag said the final rough draft should be the only document reviewed by Water and Sewer Commission. The review would have to wait for their next meeting. Members asked if HW and CSI would participate in the review? Chair Sontag said HW would participate. Director Port said there was no need for CSI feedback. He could send CSI the final version. Chair Sontag agreed that CSI was concerned with stormwater and engineering, whereas the issues under review concerned the WRPD. Waivers would have to be reviewed as well.

Mary Jo Verde made a motion to continue the Definitive Subdivision and the WRPD Special Permit public hearing to January 17, 2018. 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.*

**b) Newburyport Renovations, LLC c/o Lisa Mead  
43 Liberty Street  
Special Permit for Non-Conformities (2017-SP-09)  
DOD Special Permit (2017-SP-12)  
Continued from 11/15/17**

Planning Board  
December 20, 2017

Attorney Mead said the applicant had completed an NHC review. Scott Brown, architect, 29 Water Street, reviewed three NHC-recommended changes. A period-inappropriate decorative chimney cap was removed. The major change was reducing the two-story addition on the back of house to one-story in order to minimize impact on the abutter. He displayed the original two-story elevation and the revised elevation. Aligning the door with the window above it, as recommended, had not worked. Moving the door increased the size of the porch, leaving no buffer between the driveway and the porch step-down. Alternatively, detaching the porch and making it a small portico was undesirable in the end. Alignment efforts complicated things and made other design aspects worse. The window needed to be centered in its own space. The door was on a different plane. The original design was better. Chair Sontag asked about using an overhang? Mr. Brown said an overhang was Victorian, not the right architectural style for the house. Members agreed, as long as the original house was intact. Removed windows would be recycled, at the NHC's request. The vendor would be the Window Woman, 44 Elm Street, Amesbury. Attorney Mead said the addition had originally increased the 1,105 square feet home to over 1,600 square feet. It was now about 1,400 square feet. The house qualified as contributory in the DOD. Although it did not appear on the 1851 map, it did appear on the 1867 map. The DOD Table of Uses did not list single-family home, which was why this was a pre-existing non-conforming use. The restoration alterations were designed to be compatible with the house, located at the B2 district's edge in a gateway to a more residential area. Alterations were consistent with the Fair Street neighborhood and contributed to preserving the structure. Reducing the addition's size and adding a drywell addressed neighbor Gloria Porter's concerns.

Members were concerned that the NHC had not been more specific on the double-hung windows. Mr. Brown said the casement window, designed to look like a double-hung window, could not be seen from the public way. Were the setbacks on the lot exacerbated? Attorney Mead said no, there were no new non-conformities, only an extension of the existing non-conformities. Chair Sontag said the application proposed an intensification of existing non-conformities. Attorney Mead said the standards for a single or two-family house was whether new non-conformities were created or whether the modification was substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood than the existing non-conformity. The answer to both was no. Director Port said special permits had lower thresholds. Members concurred that it was not a dimensional variance.

Public comment open.

Gloria Porter, 22 Fair Street, asked if extending the size of the house would create more stormwater? The design changes were detrimental because there was too much being added.

Public comment closed.

Members asked where the gutters and drainage were located? Attorney Mead demonstrated on the plan where the roof would be guttered and infiltrated to a drywell on the northwestern side of the lot, but features were not on the plan and should be added as a condition. Ms. Porter said gutters would not fully address the problem. There was flooding before the old gutters fell off. George Hazeltine, property owner, said the substantial difference might be the use of solid gutters that entered the ground. Members asked if there were grading changes? Attorney Mead

Planning Board  
December 20, 2017

said no. Director Port said water would be collected and redirected. Members said gutter maintenance should be a condition. Members wanted other windows in the plan clarified.

Anne Gardner made a motion to approve the Special Permit for Non-Conformities. Leah McGavern seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

James Brugger made a motion to approve the DOD Special Permit with three conditions: 1) recycling the removed windows; 2) adding gutters and gutter maintenance, and 3) using clad double-hung wood windows with three-quarter simulated divided lights, of Marvin quality or its equivalent, for all windows except as noted on the plan. Mary Jo Verde 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.*

**c) 101-1003 State Street Condominium Trust  
101-103 State Street  
DOD Special Permit (2017-SP-10)**

Condo President Bong Yim wanted to replace all rotting porch columns. One column fell. Johnson Building and Construction, 29 Dock Lane, Salisbury, had gone before the NHC. Chair Sontag read the NHC recommendations. Did Mr. Yim have HOA approval to make the decision? Mr. Yim said yes. Chair Sontag said the NHC unanimously agreed to use nothing but wood. Mr. Yim said the contractor recommended material other than wood for durability. Members said wood columns needed proper maintenance to last. Pictures did not show the fallen column's cap. Mr. Yim said the cap was still attached. Only the column's base had rotted. Members said the three NHC recommendations would be in the conditions.

Public comment open.

Tom Kolterjahn, 64 Federal Street, co-chair Newburyport Preservation Trust (NPT), distributed photos of each column. Most were in good condition and not rotted through. The Corinthian capital should be reattached. He had the name of a contractor who could replicate the fallen column. It was the only column that needed replacing in its entirety. A small portion of rot at the base of other columns did not justify replacement. The goal was an epoxy repair in warm weather. Repair could not be done in winter. The porch should be shored up for the winter. When properly maintained, repaired columns should last another 100 years. The Trust was willing work with the HOA and the contractor, but he had concerns that the contractor recommended replacing all the columns needed. The 6 Harris Street column work was well done.

Mr. Yim said safety was HOA's main concern. They did not want to replace columns one at a time every year and wanted to ensure they all matched.



Public comment closed.

Members said the NHC and NPT wanted to preserve the columns. Could a third party address the durability of a repair? Director Port said it was customary for the City to hire a consultant. Members said the contractor might have done an evaluation. He should be present. Chair Sontag said the issues were historic replication and historic preservation, which meant repairing as much as possible. The contractor should come before the board to discuss the columns' integrity. Members said a contractor was not qualified to evaluate structural integrity and his opinion could be biased. Conditions should include maintaining the Corinthian caps and whether or not rot had affected the integrity. A \$140/hour consultant would take about two hours to assess and issue a report. If they were structurally sound, that would be in perpetuity.

Stephanie Niketic, 93 High Street, said the NPT could recommend a consultant.

Chair Sontag said a consulting structural engineer's report would be the first of two steps. The report should recommend repair techniques, identifying those that would remain structurally sound. Porch and columns should be secured for the winter. Director Port would get two quotes, including the NHC-recommended consultant, and make the peer review choice. Step one could begin as soon as money was in hand. Members wanted the reviewer to read the NHC recommendations but remain objective. Mr. Yim would contact Planning Office administrator right away. He asked if it was necessary to replicate the design? Chair Sontag said yes.

Mary Jo Verde made a motion to hire a consultant to review all columns for structural integrity, determine a method for repair with wood-like material, and identify which columns should be replaced, by January 17, 2018. Joe Lamb seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

Leah McGavern made a motion to continue the DOD Special Permit to January 17, 2018. Andrew Shapiro 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.*

- d) Ganton LLC c/o Lisa Mead**  
**372 Merrimac Street, 341 Merrimac Street, and 10 Ashland Court**  
**Special Permit for Use (2017-SP-11)**

Attorney Lisa Mead said the proposal would reshuffle the 3-story Mersen building's interior for professional office use with no change to the exterior or parking. The Kane's examined the parking lot lighting at Jane Snow's request. The new use required 289 of the existing 300-plus parking spaces. Site plan review was not required. David Hancock, CBT Architects, 110 Canal

Planning Board  
December 20, 2017

Street, Boston showed floor plans that condensed the Mersen offices and light manufacturing to one portion of the building, added an atrium for daylight, and added new interior offices.

Attorney Mead said professional office space was more marketable than industrial space and was allowed in the I2 by SP. Offices also allowed the applicant to fully utilize the building. The use was desirable to the public and good for the City. Patrick Crimmins, project manager, Tighe & Bond, 177 Corporate Drive, Portsmouth, presented trip generation data. The existing professional, light industrial, and warehousing use had 167 peak AM trips and 163 peak PM trips on weekdays. The new use would have 146 peak AM trips and 142 peak PM trips on weekdays for 1,045 total trips. Adding the atrium eliminated some office space and reduced the trips. Attorney Mead said the proposed did not create undue traffic congestion, impair public safety, adversely impact public systems, nor impair the district character. Reducing the light industrial use lessened the overall impact because there would be fewer trucks. Thirty-three old toilet fixtures would be replaced with 38 new fixtures using 40% less water. There was no requirement to change the parking lot, but cut sheets and a photometric plan were provided for installing LED dark sky compliant lighting, 20-feet in total height. Some light would fall onto the street front for safety reasons. Old poles would be removed.

Members asked if landscaping or islands could be added to the parking lot? Attorney Mead said the owner was interested in improvements, but they were not in a position to change the lot because of the stormwater requirements. Members asked if the roof would change? Mr. Hancock said the front doors would change also. Existing mezzanines had higher ceilings than the other 20-foot ceilings. Eliminating the mezzanines recouped some office space lost by the atrium. Were changes discussed with the Planning Office before tonight? Mr. Hancock said yes. Chair Sontag asked if the traffic occurred at a different time? Mr. Crimmins said, no. Attorney Mead said that Mersen's current office use spread out the trips further than the manufacturing use trips.

Public comment open.

Rob Germinara, 2 and 8 Ashland Street, was in support. He showed a wetlands plan of the Mersen property and demonstrated the location of a drainage swale abutting 8 Ashland street. Swales were cleaned annually, but the entire lot was in a flood zone. Stormwater issues were not dealt with properly during the last parking lot expansion. He encouraged a site visit. Screening would be beneficial. Installing light poles required notifying the Conservation Commission.

Brooks Patterson, 19 Ashland Street, was in support. The parking lot was an eyesore to the streetscape. A buffer strip would soften the edge. Adding trees could mitigate a northeast wind that whipped across the lot.

Charlie Tontar, 29 Jefferson, was in support. There was a broad interest in parking lot improvements from residents who were not abutters.

Andy Simmonds, 25 Ashland Street, was in support and wanted parking lot beautification.

Public comment closed.

Planning Board  
December 20, 2017

Attorney Mead said the Kane brothers needed to reactivate the building in order to make a plan for further improvements. They would come back with a master plan in the future.

James Brugger made a motion to approve the Special Permit for Use. Tania Hartford 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) Procedural Improvements***

Efficiency and effectiveness were discussed, including informal discussions, presentations for completeness votes, applications that met Planning Office approval, public comment and questions, agenda length, summary presentations and subdividing content for large projects, Planning Office recommendations and determinations on application preparedness, late arriving material, applicant presentations in general, staff reports, board-specific discussion, and developing a simplified guideline for applicants.

**5. Adjournment**

James Brugger made a motion to adjourn. Joe Lamb seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 11:20 PM.

Respectfully submitted -- Linda Guthrie