

**City of Newburyport
Planning Board
December 6, 2017**

6 PM Meeting

The meeting was called to order at 6:04 PM.

1. Roll Call

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

Absent: Tania Hartford

In attendance for the City Council's Planning & Development Committee and Committee of the Whole: Ed Cameron, Jared Eigerman, Larry Guinta, Sharif Zeid

Absent: Barry Connell

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

Joint Public Hearings with the City Council's Planning & Development Committee and Committee of the Whole on Proposed Zoning Changes

Councilor Cameron called the Planning & Development Committee meeting to order.

a) Prohibiting Granting of Use Variances

Councilor Eigerman said Use Variances were disfavored because they nullify basic zoning. Discussions began in 2014, but the council had waited for completion of the Comprehensive Rezoning. Today's building boom necessitated immediate action. Planning Office data showed that of 52 use variances approved in the last five years, half were for signs. Yet, the City had a sign ordinance. The 2 Parker Street Use Variance that created three affordable units on land cobbled together from the cemetery was troubling given the 40R amendment rider disallowing use of the overlay until a safe crossing to the train station existed. A similar 40R application would have created six affordable units. He gave examples of Use Variances he worked on during his 18-month ZBA tenure that were addressed by changing the Use Table. Additional Use Table issues would be addressed. Allowing Use Variances would be an end run around the downzoning amendment. This amendment could come before the new council in January.

Members wanted Councilor Eigerman to raise the issue with City Council right away. Chair Sontag supported changing the Use Table to avoid issues at the outset. Use Variances had been used to increase density in residential areas, aggravating infill-related issues. She wanted to eliminate residential area Use Variances. Councilor Eigerman would fix the Use Table to allow offices, retail, and non-profits in the business park. He cited issues with the brewery and an interest from the YMCA. Chair Sontag said the Y's issues had been the mix of uses and safety.

Planning Board
December 6, 2017

Public comment open.

Tom Kolterjahn, 64 Federal Street, Newburyport Preservation Trust (NPT), was in support.

Stephanie Niketic, 93 High Street, was in support. A Use Variance request to convert a grandfathered single-family home in the downtown B3 into a two-family with insufficient parking was withdrawn recently. Use Variances came up in a variety of ways.

Chair Sontag said disallowing Use Variances in residential areas and allowing them by special permit in other districts would maintain the boards over site.

Kathleen Schoonmaker, 6 Independent Street, was in support.

Jeanette Isabella, 1 Lime Street, asked if a special permit was like a Use Variance? Chair Sontag said that certain uses would be allowed by special permit as opposed to allowing the broad reach of use variances.

Judy Mouradian, 46 Liberty Street, was in support.

Public comment closed.

Director Port said Use Variances had the potential to undermine the City Council's authority if the ZBA continued to be allowed to grant them.

Members asked if the examples of signage Use Variances were understood? Councilor Eigerman said businesses would install as many signs as possible. Wall signs, like Famous Pizza used, were allowed. Director Port said Famous Pizza had taken down a freestanding sign and lost the right to replace it. The goal was to reduce signage clutter. Councilor Eigerman clutter had worsened since the NRA's deed-enforced sign restrictions had expired. Director Port said the City had a secondary zoning ordinance that dealt with signage. Chair Sontag asked about a special permit and updating the Use Table? She did not want to loose the option for free-standing signs for businesses that did not face a road. Members wanted to stiffen the criteria at the same time. Director Port agreed with Chair Sontag. Several years ago the CVS located in a sensitive area next to Bartlett Mall made a substantive change by illuminating the box around the 'CVS' letters. Councilor Eigerman asked to continue the hearing to allow for more input.

Jared Eigerman made a motion continue the public hearing to January 17, 2018. Ed Cameron seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

Don Walters made a motion to continue the public hearing to January 17, 2018. 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.

b) Zoning Map Changes – R3 to R2

Councilor Eigerman there was no need to include the High Street addresses on the amendment Councilor Earls sponsored because the High Street zoning ordinance passed. Director Port said the original map, roughly rectangular, would replace the modified map. Councilor Cameron noted it was all on the north side of High Street. Chair Sontag said the correct map was Federal to Fruit and Fair Streets. Councilor Cameron said the B3 Tannery area was not included.

Public comment open.

Kathleen Schoonmaker, 6 Independent Street was disappointed that three 1700s structures on Independent Street were not included.

Jeanette Isabella, 1 Lime Street, thought Lime Street was to be included. Chair Sontag said Lime Street was already downzoned to two-family. This was an amendment to that ordinance.

Tom Kolterjahn, 64 Federal Street, co-chair NPT, was in support. He knew of two developers already affected by the previously passed ordinance and a large addition was downsized.

Jeff Santos, 10 Spring Street, was in support.

Ms. Isabella asked about developer's applications already submitted? Director Port said if the amendment passed they were not protected unless a permit in hand was as of the first advertisement date.

Judy Mouradian, 46 Liberty Street, was in support.

Public comment closed.

Leah McGavern made a motion to recommend adoption of the proposed zoning amendment and to forward this to the full council with the agreement to pursue an update to the Newburyport Zoning Ordinance Zoning Map in January 2018. James Brugger seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

Director Port spoke with the building commissioner about the timing of ordinances taking effect. The zoning administrator would start reviewing applications in January 2018.

Councilor Cameron made a motion to close the Planning & Development Committee's portion of the public hearing. The Committee submitted a couple of revisions on Complete Streets to Director Port. He would bring the Master Plan out of committee to the full council.

Ms. Niketic said the Chamber of Commerce would be giving their testimony to councilors. Shouldn't they be here? Councilor Eigerman said the Chamber was not able to attend tonight.

Planning Board
December 6, 2017

Joe Lamb adjourned the board's portion of the joint public meeting 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.

7:00 PM Meeting

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM.

1. Roll Call

In attendance for the Planning Board: James Brugger, Anne Gardner, Joe Lamb, Leah McGavern, Andrew Shapiro, Bonnie Sontag, Mary Jo Verde and Don Walters. Tania Hartford arrived at 7:10 PM.

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

2. Public Hearings

- a) Proposed Zoning Change – Hotel/Inn (#105), Lodging House (#106), and B&B (#110) and Short-Term Residential Rental Unit Changes
Continued from 11/1/17*

Councilor Cameron opened the Planning and Development Committee's portion of the public hearing. There was general agreement for owner occupied Airbnbs and a preference for licensing in the amendment sponsored by Councilors Tontar and Vogel, but the issues were not straightforward. The committee recommended letting the current proposal pass and reintroducing it again with the new council. He would share the many emails he received. Councilor Eigerman said state law required re-advertising the amendment. Chair Sontag said a joint public hearing on a new ordinance proposal would occur next year without public comment tonight unless there was new information. Councilor Eigerman said after the last meeting, Deputy Fire Chief Bradbury pointed out state fire codes related to the number of occupants had to be addressed.

Public comment open.

Public comment closed.

Jared Eigerman made a motion to close public testimony. Ed Cameron seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

Councilor Eigerman made a motion to close the Planning and Development Committee portion of the joint public hearing. Ed Cameron seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

Leah McGavern made a motion to recommend that no action be taken to adopt the proposed zoning amendment at this time, and that the City Council and Planning Board revisit regulation of “short term rental units” (through zoning and licensing) in January 2018 when the new Council memberships can be involved in a properly advertised hearing process. Tania Hartford 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. General Business

- a) The minutes of 11/15/17 were approved. Andrew Shapiro made a motion to approve the minutes. Joe Lamb seconded the motion and **eight** members voted in favor. Don Walters 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) 11 Center Street (2017-SPR-05) – Request for Minor Modification

The applicant requested a continuance in order to appear before the Newburyport Historical Commission (NHC) before the board took up the issue.

Members said it was a major modification. The request could be denied. Chair Sontag said the applicant was before the NHC tonight.

Ann Gardner made a motion to grant the applicant’s request for a continuance of this public hearing until January 17, 2018. Mary Jo Verde seconded the motion and eight members voted in favor. Don Walters was opposed.

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

Chair Sontag said the board needed to make a recommendation to the ZBA because there were two possible regulations under which the application could be considered.

Scott Cameron, Morin Cameron Group, 66 Elm Street, Danvers, presented a color rendering of the site. The Essex National Heritage Commission had expressed an interest in informational kiosks in a sheltered sitting area, located near the Rail Trail on the waterside of the building where there was bike storage. The Waterfront West Overlay District (WWOD) zoning required five variances. The building height, reduced to 40 feet, no longer needed a height variance if the proposed public accommodation was accepted. The four-acre land area variance was still requested. Existing non-conformities related to the lot shape. A dimensional variance was needed. The WWOD required 10 feet above the parking elevation, resulting in a good design.

The current Waterfront Marine Use (WMU) zoning required eight variances, including street frontage, height (limited to 25 feet and resulting in a two-story building), lot coverage, front set back, and side yard set backs. The WMU zoning pre-dated the current flood mapping. The resulting building would be only one foot above the parking elevation and was not a good design for the required mixed-commercial use. The building would be elevated on a small lot with no way to access the adjacent land, no frontage on Merrimac Street or the water, and a limit of five units. The WMU rendered the site unbuildable for the applicant's proposal. Parking would be outside rather than under the building, not a good way to develop an area with a lot of surface parking already. A good portion of the side property was an already paved public access for Michael's Harborside. Lou Miniccuci, MINCO, 231 Sutton Street, North Andover, said the main issue with the WMU was sea level rise. The proposal aligned with the Master Plan guidelines with 25 condominiums on ½ acres with all parking on site, contributed to housing stock with 10% long-term deed restricted affordability, and a compact use of the land. The building had elevators for the disabled and seniors, was energy efficient and healthy, would be the second LEED-certified building in Newburyport and there was existing infrastructure, including easy access to the Rail Trail. Workforce housing needs were supported. The parcel was not four acres but would be consistent with surroundings and promoted an active, diverse population. The 9,000 square foot public space included the road. It was similar in size to the Harbormaster building's park. He compared it to Waterfront West's 10,000 square feet of public space.

Member comments: The proposal was not in keeping with the intent of the WWOD. There was too much density in one location with too many variances. Why decide the zoning when the WWOD did not exist yet? Director Port said the four-acre requirement was discussed previously. The rationale for a zoning discussion was the ZBA's request for a recommendation. Both

Planning Board
December 6, 2017

scenarios had variances. Members asked why give the ZBA eight variances to consider versus only four or five? Director Port said isolating this piece of land in a vacuum was not a good idea. Members preferred to look projects individually. Proposed was one small building on a small parcel and newly compliant with WWOD height. The remaining issue was density. How would excluding the road relate to the requirement of 33% public space?

Mr. Cameron said all variances related to the property shape. The existing road would change. He displayed the zoning plan to show how the plan met the 33% requirement, but not the 10,000 square feet requirement. The proposal did not need a density variance because it was consistent with two other buildings in the area. Chair Sontag asked for more density detail. Director Port said the WWOD required 20,000 square feet for the first four units and 4,000 square feet for each additional unit and started with a huge four-acre requirement. Density exceeded what the WMU allowed. Chair Sontag said the board should look at each zoning district on its own, but under WWOD, the zoned district should be viewed as a whole. While the proposed needed a special permit condition for density, but the board did not want the Waterfront West proposal looked at the same way. A member said the board was considering a project in the context of something that did not yet exist. Chair Sontag said she was thinking only of zoning. Members, noting the mismatch between the proposed and the zoning, said there was no guidance from either zoning approach resulting in an arbitrary process. Mr. Miniccuci said density was met by the 50% lot coverage and parking requirements. Director Port said lot coverage was not only the building, and in this case, the board was only looking at the building.

Mr. Minicucci said he wanted market rate units to be more affordable than market rate. There were three affordable units with an average size of 900-1200 square feet for one to three bedrooms. The largest unit was 1400 square feet. Members said the plan read as dense and squished on the site. Mr. Miniccuci said the existing building had far outlived its usefulness on the site. Due to the new floodplain, a two-story building would look inappropriate. The former property owner had worked with NED originally, but NED felt the site did not fit with their plans. The City should not have to wait until Waterfront West was built out to see this site developed. Could a subcommittee be formed to determine what would be suitable on the site? Chair Sontag was amenable. The subcommittee could be a joint effort with the ZBA. Members asked what about Chapter 91 requirements? Mr. Cameron said he was told to ask how the City wanted to use the public space. Director Port said a Rail Trail rest spot was a good use, but there would be two parking bays between the Rail Trail and the building. Chair Sontag said the project area was small. Karen Polistrano, MINCO's project manager, said lot size and height were similar to Horton's Yard. Square footage was similar to Merrimack Landing and 44 Merrimac Street. Members said the space was unique. It abutted the bridge near an elevated highway.

Public comment open.

Linda Lambert, 58 Merrimac Street, had height and the density concerns. Horton's Yard residents did not want nine other Horton's Yard buildings built in Waterfront West. Jeff Speck said to use a variety of heights. If four stories were allowed under WWOD zoning, NED would want the same. Where would height variety come from? This project initiated the waterfront development whether looked at individually or all together. Allowing 25 condos on ½ acre

Planning Board
December 6, 2017

would give NED the ability to put 2,500 condos on their land. Right now there were several dumpsters against the property. Public space next to dumpsters was not a public benefit.

Jeanette Isabella, 1 Lime Street, asked who would pay for the consultant? Chair Sontag said it would not be the City. Would subcommittee meetings be open to the public? Was there a picture of the building? Chair Sontag said a subcommittee would have working meetings and the results would come into the public meeting. The board's picture of the building was not open to the public at this point. Ms. Isabella was concerned about precedents for NED.

Public comment closed.

There was agreement to form a subcommittee with Tania Hartford and Leah McGavern participating. Chair Sontag would talk to the ZBA and discuss the consultant aspect with the Planning Office. The topic would come back to the board for further discussion.

d) Brown Street Extension (2007-DEF-02) – Request for release of funds held in Tripartite Agreement

Mark Depiero, TMS Architects, 1 Cate Street, Portsmouth, said the paving was finished and three were signs needed. After approval it was learned that cars driving down could not turnaround. 'No Parking Fire Lane' signs were needed for the hammerhead turnaround.

Chair Sontag said the board would retain 10%, or \$32,900, until the City accepted the road or three years had lapsed after approval, as long as there were no landscaping or roadway issues. The board would release \$63,367.11.

Andrew Shapiro made a motion to grant a partial release of the performance guarantee for work completed in accordance with the plans and the installation of the signs. 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.

4. Public Hearings (continued)

***b) New England Development
83 Merrimac Street and 90 Pleasant Street
Definitive Subdivision (2047-DEF-02)
Continued from 11/15/17***

Planning Board
December 6, 2017

Joe Lamb made a motion to grant the applicant's request for a continuance of this public hearing until January 17, 2018. 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.

**c) Newburyport Manager, LLC c/o New England Development
Brown's Wharf, 58 McKay's Wharf, 72 Merrimac Street,
86-90 Merrimac Street, and 92 Merrimac Street
Definitive Subdivision (2017-DEF-02)
Continued from 11/15/17**

Scott Kelly, New England Development (NED), 75 Park Plaza, Boston, said a definitive subdivision approval cleaned up lot lines. It was not a review the Waterfront West development. Most CSI comments were resolved and the engineer added a note about seeking Conservation Commission approval. An open issue that CSI deferred to the board concerned one of five lots, the barbell-shaped lot connected by a strip of land. Lot sizes were based on use. Chair Sontag said the strip was not the only parcel access. The City's legal input agreed with the applicant.

Member comments: Why approve before hearing Conservation Commission feedback? Mr. Kelly said NED would not apply for a Conservation Commission review until it was certain the project would go forward. Director Port said the applicant would have to abide by both boards' approvals, as well as return to this board, irrespective of what the Conservation Commission did. Chair Sontag said CSI's review had two engineering conditions, thrust blocking at all bends in the force main and a guardrail. Director Port said the minor adjustments did not require plan revisions. The board could approve the plan set under the condition that any conditions would be incorporated. Stephen Glowacki, RJ O'Connell, 80 Montvale Ave, Stoneham, asked if CSI was wanted sidewalks across Merrimac Street? Chair Sontag said sidewalks should connect to the existing sidewalk on the east side of Merrimac Street. Mr. Glowacki said he added accessibility ramps. Members confirmed there would be a site plan review. Chair Sontag said the land was divided for building a roadway that met regulations. The lot had to be usable and accessible.

Public comment open.

Public comment closed.

Mary Jo Verde made a motion to approve the Definitive Subdivision with two conditions recommended by CSI and any other conditions that arose. Leah McGavern seconded the motion and seven members voted in favor. Tania Hartford and Don Walters abstained.

Motion Approved.

Planning Board
December 6, 2017

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) Gorman Homes LLC**
32 Union Street
Definitive Subdivision (2017-DEF-03)
Continued from 11/1/17

Joe Lamb made a motion to grant the applicant's request for a continuance of this public hearing until January 17, 2018. 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.

- e) Parker 2 Realty Trust**
2 Parker Street and 151-155 State Street
Definitive Subdivision (2017-DEF-04), Major Site Plan Review (2017-SPR-06), and
VI.C Special Permit (2017-SP-07)
Continued from 11/15/17

Attorney Lisa Mead, Mead, Talerman, and Costa, LLC, 30 Green Street, said issues from the final CSI review were addressed and resolved. The Conservation Commission approval and Order of Conditions were received last night. There was one tweak.

Engineer Chad Branon, Fieldstone Land Consultants PLLC, 206 Elm Street, Milford, NH, said the majority of CSI comments related to stormwater management issues not requiring a lot of plan changes and that included ground cover for disturbed land, considerable redundancy in plan labeling, and additional plan notations for drainage details. Changes from a total of four CSI reviews had also included increasing the size of rain garden #1 by a third, shifting two rain gardens for 10 feet of separation from foundations, and rain garden overflow outlets for large rain events. The Conservation Commission asked for labeled snow storage areas, which he demonstrated on plans as located off both proposed parking spaces on Hines Way, the west side of Hines Way near unit #8, two areas around the cul de sac, and two areas in the back of Derrick's Path. The commission wanted a split rail fence extending up the side of the Derrick's Path rain garden, a stockade fence along parcel 394A, and additional plantings for buffer restoration. Chair Sontag asked about delineating the rain garden near the mailboxes? The board had experience with residents believing rain gardens were part of their yard. Attorney Mead said the front rain garden was not a concern for the commission, but could be marked with a bollard.

Planning Board
December 6, 2017

The project was filed prior to the bylaw change for the community benefit under Section VI.C. The applicant agreed to redesign the entire project for the intermodal path, at the City's request, and to construct the intermodal path. One affordable three-bedroom unit would be at 80% of AMI. One affordable two-bedroom unit would be at 80% of AMI (\$280,000) and another at 70% of AMI (\$230,000). The applicant would also engineer and construct a 240-foot path extension to the cemetery gate after the City completed a design, secured permits and property rights, and took down trees. The Conservation Commission was concerned about design coordination between the segments. Construction would not begin until issuance of the 15th certificate of occupancy and would be completed by issuance of the last certificate of occupancy. If the City had not received permissions and permits by 2023, the applicant would not be obligated to construct the path extension. Director Port had no objections, but did have some minor edits.

Member comments: What if the City changed the path design? Director Port said it was a straight shot without much room for redesign. Members agreed the applicant should not be held to task if the City was unable to complete the work. What about security if the applicant did not perform? Director Port would work that into the language. Attorney Mead said the path extension was extra and could be considered open space. Ed Hill, property owner, said the 15th unit might be ready for a certificate of occupancy in two years. The City would have 22 months to secure permits. Members said there could be a force majeure event. Attorney Mead said certificates of occupancy could be withheld. Mr. Branon said the slope was modest, no encroachments were anticipated, and there were no wetlands, but the cemetery's fence was in the City's right-of-way. Director Port said the land was fairly flat and all grass. An easement might be needed. Members asked about the timing for affordable units? Mr. Hill said the three units would be done at construction completion intervals of one-third, two-thirds, and three-thirds. Members suggested adding a condition. Could the applicant contribute to a trust if the City ran into permitting and property rights issues? Director Port said it was reasonable but added complexity. He did not think a condition was necessary. Attorney Mead said the incentive was that completing the Rail Trail added to marketability, but a donation could be made to the City for the Rail Trail. Director Port said the DOT would be focusing on the area next year. Attorney Mead said a design would be submitted to the City in the next two months for planning purposes. Members appreciated the lower AMI and Rail Trail extension. Chair Sontag wanted to change the wording from 'sale of 15th unit' to 'certificate of occupancy for the 15th unit.' Director Port reviewed his edits to include indemnification and insurance provisions and approved design and construction plans.

Public comment open.

Public comment closed.

Leah McGavern made a motion to approve the Section VI.C as modified. James Brugger seconded the motion and seven members voted in favor. Don Walters and Tania Hartford abstained.

Mary Jo made a motion to approve the Major Site Plan Review with the two modifications. Anne Gardner seconded the motion and seven members voted in favor. Don Walters and Tania Hartford abstained.

Planning Board
December 6, 2017

Anne Gardner made a motion to grant waivers for the length of the road, the right-of-way diameter, and the outside pavement diameter. Leah McGavern seconded the motion and seven members voted in favor. Don Walters and Tania Hartford abstained.

Anne Gardner made a motion to approve the Definitive Subdivision with the waivers. Leah McGavern seconded the motion and seven members voted in favor. Don Walters and Tania Hartford abstained.

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.

***f) Low Street Redevelopment, LLC c/o Bernie Christopher
255R Low Street
Site Plan Review (2017-SPR-07)***

Andrew Shapiro read the notice. Steve Sawyer, DCI, 68 Pleasant Street, showed the original plan and said no more than 20% of the buffer could be disturbed and one lot was 100% buffer. That was too much to disturb per the Conservation Commission. He showed a revised plan that compressed parking into 36 spaces with three treads and four risers to the main parking lot. When added to the original 46 parking spaces, the parking was six spaces per 1,000 square feet. Lot disturbance was reduced to 20%, with 15% on the main lot, even though the project crept into the 25-foot buffer zone. The stormwater analysis needed to be redone, either to lift the lot a bit for infiltration chambers or to use permeable pavement. There was one-way circulation around the building, a 24-foot wide egress, and three percent or less grade to access the lower level parking. Parking spaces were 18 feet with a 24-foot isle. Cars that found the lot full could back into a one-point turn to leave. The smaller lot pleased the Conservation Commission.

Member comments: Did the building use change? Mr. Sawyer said there were differences between medical and medical office uses. Should zoning be updated? Members opposed extending the building's parking. What about shared parking with Port Plaza's massive lot that was never full across the street? Mr. Sawyer said crossing Low Street was a problem. Director Port said City adoption of the parking amendment recommended by the board would provide some options in the future, such as making changes when more than one building or more than one use existed. Chair Sontag said, in this case, there were two different owners. Members asked if parking was for employees or visitors? Mr. Sawyer said both. Employee parking across the street with a pedestrian light could have leasing issues. He would talk to the applicant. Chair Sontag asked if there were requirements for more plantings? Mr. Sawyer said parking had to be broken up every 12 spaces, but that did not include plantings. The footprint could not expand. Some trees could be added. Members wanted to move employee parking off site. Mr. Sawyer said permeable bituminous was more expensive. Chair Sontag suggested a cost comparison.

Joe Lamb made a motion to grant the applicant's request for a continuance of the public hearing until January 17, 2018. 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 Adoption (approve minor edits incorporated by City Council)

Anne Gardner made a motion to amend the 2017 Master Plan update (prior to its final posting and hard-copy reproduction), to incorporate six (6) specific edits requested by Councilor Eigerman, as indicated in a mark-up version of the selected pages, provided in advance of this meeting by the Director of Planning & Development. James Brugger seconded the motion and eight members voted in favor. Tania Hartford abstained.

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) Complete Streets Policy

There was no action on this tonight.

c) Other Updates

A discussion for procedural efficiency for the board and the staff, such as receiving materials on the day of the meeting and informal discussions, would take place at the next meeting,

5. Adjournment

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

The meeting adjourned at 9:52 PM.

Respectfully submitted -- Linda Guthrie