QUINCY PLANNING BOARD
Quincy City Hall, 1305 Hancock Street, Quincy, MA 02169
(617) 376-1362 FAX (617) 376-1097
TTY/TDD (617) 376-1375

PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, August 24, 2016

MEMBERS PRESENT: Coleman Barry, Sean Callaghan, Glen Comiso, Maureen Glynn, Richard Meade

MEMBERS ABSENT: **none**

OTHERS PRESENT: James Fatseas, Planning Director
Rob Stevens Principal Planner
Susan Laracy-Karim, Assistant Planner

Meeting held in 1st Floor Boards and Commissions Room, 1305 Hancock Street. Quincy City Hall Front Building, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

Meeting called to order and attendance roll call taken at 7:01 PM by Chairman Richard Meade. All members present at roll.

Chairman Meade read aloud public hearing ground rules, as follows:
PUBLIC HEARING: PLANNING BOARD GENERAL RULES
The Planning Board reserves the right to administer oaths (Chair), summon witnesses, call for the production of papers, cross-examine any person giving testimony during the proceedings, declare recess, limit debate, inspect the subject site or buildings during reasonable hours and adjourn the hearing for cause.

The order of business will be as announced by the Chair.

All questions will be directed to the Chair. Any person wishing to speak, please raise hand for recognition from the Chair. When recognized, please stand, state name and address, specific interest in the proceedings, and special credentials, if any, pertaining to the presentation.
Please speak slowly and within the context of the hearing matter. Hearing is being stenographed and taped for the public record. The Planning Board reserves the right to exclude any unnecessary, irrelevant, repetitive or harassing presentations.
Cross-examination between parties in interest or any other person will be permitted only after due recognition from the Chair.
All documents, papers and plans introduced in the hearing shall be clearly identified by name or some other designation, and the person so introducing them shall also be identified by name and address. A Planning Board Exhibit Letter will be assigned to each submittal unless the submittal has been specifically identified by an Exhibit Letter. When excerpts

from case law are cited, the complete text of findings shall be furnished the Planning Board within fourteen (14) days.

VOTE TO ACCEPT June 8, 2016 PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
MOTION: by Vice Chairman Coleman Barry to approve the June 8, 2016 Planning Board meeting minutes as written.
SECOND: Member Glen Comiso
VOTE: 5-0 Motion Carries

VOTE TO ACCEPT July 13, 2016 PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
Assistant Planner Susan Laracy-Karim informed Chairman Meade that the July 13, 2016 Planning Board Meeting Minutes had not been completed for approval by the Board.

7:03PM Continued Public Hearing – 30-34 Chapman Street – Site Plan/Special Permit - Planning Board Case No. 2015-47 Planner Rob Stevens read a Request for Withdrawal Without Prejudice, dated August 23, 2016, submitted by Applicant's Attorney Christopher Harrington.
MOTION: by Vice Chairman Coleman Barry to accept the withdrawal.
SECOND: Member Glen Comiso
VOTE: 5-0 Motion Carries

7:04PM Continued Public Hearing – 77-83 Newbury Avenue Modification – Site Plan/Special Permit - Planning Board Case No. 2016-08
Planner Rob Stevens read a Request for Withdrawal Without Prejudice, dated August 22, 2016, submitted by Applicant's Architect Philip Hresko.
MOTION: by Vice Chairman Coleman Barry to accept the withdrawal.
SECOND: Member Glen Comiso
VOTE: 5-0 Motion Carries

7:04PM Continued Public Hearing – R264 West Street – Site Plan/Special Permit - Planning Board Case No. 2016-05
Planner Rob Stevens read a Request for Continuance to the September 14, 2016 Planning Board meeting, dated August 23, 2016, submitted by Applicant's Attorney Edward J. Fleming..
MOTION: by Vice Chairman Coleman Barry to accept the continuance.
SECOND: Member Glen Comiso
VOTE: 5-0 Motion Carries

7:05PM Continued Public Hearing – 500 Commander Shea Boulevard, Boston Scientific – Special Permit - Planning Board Case No. 2016-07
Planner Rob Stevens read a Request for Withdrawal Without Prejudice, dated August 24, 2016, submitted by Applicant's Attorney Matthew Snell
MOTION: by Member Sean Callaghan to accept the withdrawal.
SECOND: Member Glen Comiso
VOTE: 5-0 Motion Carries

7:05PM Continued Public Hearing – 150 & 154 Quincy Avenue – Site Plan/Special Permit - Planning Board Case No. 2016-10 Chairman Meade opened the

continued public hearing and introduced Applicant's Attorney Chris Harrington, who introduced Applicants Tony and Larry Agnitti and the project's Traffic Engineer, Jack Gillon. Attorney Harrington gave a review of the project, citing compliance to the parameters of its Residence C Zoning District designation via provision of adequate number of units and parking spaces. He cited that project Engineer Bill Buckley had modified and corrected issues in response to the City's independent Peer Review. Mr. Gillon then addressed traffic issues in response to the City's Traffic and Fire Department comments, citing that the consensus was they were not in favor of a no left turn sign and traffic island proposed for the exit/entryway to the property. Mr. Buckley said the most recent revisions to the proposed plan were minor in nature, including the egress at building 4, reconfiguration of the public way in the rear of the building, and modification to the landscape plan to include understory plantings. Mr. Meade asked if this revision would result in visibility being impeded, to which Mr. Buckley answered no. There were no other questions from Board members. Deidre Hall, counsel for the DPW was then introduced and explained changes in the stormwater system, which included upland drainage, perforated piping and increased retention to hasten drainage above the standard requirements. Ms. Hall stated the need for construction easements. The Chairman then opened the hearing up for public comments and questions. Abutter Donna Calderal of 140 Quincy Ave stated that she had met with the owners to discuss her concerns regarding property protection during construction and the construction timeline. It was agreed upon that the Applicant's Attorney would work with the neighbors, but that there was a need for a written commitment and provision of photographic documentation of existing conditions as proof of any post-construction damage. Councillor Croall gave an historical recap of the project's yearlong vetting, which included neighborhood meetings, Applicants' agreement to contribute to public safety in the area, the project's aesthetic improvements, all of which found him in favor of the project. Mr. Meade then read into the record comment letters submitted by abutters Ryan Maciej and Joe Jackson.

Chairman Richard Meade asked for a motion to close the Site Plan Special Permit public hearing. Member Glen Comiso made a motion to close. Member Sean Callaghan seconded the motion and it was so voted unanimously.

Principal Planner Rob Stevens read aloud the recommendations with conditions prepared by the Department of Planning & Community Development, as follows:

The Applicant is seeking a Site Plan Review under Quincy Zoning Ordinance Title 17, Section 9.5 (Site Plan Review), and Special Permit under Section 5.1.17 (Parking Waiver).

The Applicant is proposing to demolish two existing wood frame structure and construct a new five (5) structure three (3) story residential townhouses, containing seventeen (17) units. The five buildings contain 33, 456 ± gross square feet of living area plus garages. The proposed development site contains 36,337 square feet of land and is located at **150 & 154 Quincy Avenue**. The proposal includes 34 internal parking spaces with five additional surface spaces for visitors. The subject property is located within the Residence C Zoning District and is shown on Assessors Map 2085C, Lot 5 & 6.

The Applicant was granted a waiver from the wind and shadow study.

Comment letters were received from the DPW, Building Department, Fire Department, and Traffic Engineer and were provided in the Planning Board packets.

The Applicant has submitted an application requesting variances from the ZBA for side yard setbacks.

The independent engineer peer review was completed by William Maher, P.E. of Nitsch Engineering, Inc. The final peer review report was issued on August 10, 2016. Most of the comments and issues have been addressed by the Applicant to the satisfaction of the peer reviewer.

The Applicant has requested a Special Permit from the Planning Board under Section 5.1.17-Parking Waiver in order to construct the necessary parking which will crossover into the side yard setback in the rear corner of the property.

Recommendation

The Department recommends that the Board vote to approve the site plan review in accordance with Quincy Zoning Ordinance Section 9.5.1 and issues a Special Permit under Section 5.1.17 Parking Waiver subject to the following special conditions:

CONDITIONS

1. Planning Board Site Plan Approval is contingent upon the Zoning Board of Appeal (ZBA) approval of the Applicant's Variance application.

2. The Applicant shall adhere to the requirements of the City's Tree Ordinance.

3. Prior to any Building Permits being issued, the Applicant will perform a water flow test with the City's Water Department.

4. The Applicant shall obtain approval of the stormwater and sewer connection from the Public Work Department prior to applying for a Building Permit.

5. It is crucial that any activities proposed for this development not cause rodent problems for abutters. Prior to obtaining Demolition or Building Permits the Applicant must submit a rodent control plan to the Department of Health for review and approval at least ten (10) days prior to any site activities. Rodent control practices must continue of the duration of the construction phase of the project.

6. The Applicant shall develop a dust control plan to be submitted to the Department of Health and implemented during any site activities to ensure compliance with state air quality regulations and shall commit to conformance with both local and state regulations regarding noise since this project is within a residential neighborhood and construction could create noise generating activities.

7. The Applicant shall submit a pre-demolition survey to the Health Department for any potential Asbestos Containing Materials (ACM) to be conducted by a licensed DLI-certified inspector. If ACM is present it must be removed by a licensed

contractor and a post abatement inspection must be performed by DLI certified project monitor.

8. The Applicant shall submit a Construction Management Plan (CMP) to the Traffic Engineer for review and approval at the same time that the building permit application is submitted for review by the Inspectional Services Department. Review of the CMP will take a minimum of two weeks. The Construction Management Plan shall include but is not limited to the following items:
    a. Traffic Management Plans for any sidewalk replacement, curb ramps and utility construction
    b. Truck route for deliveries to and from the highway
    c. Truck Access to the site
    d. Construction signage
    e. Construction work hours/days
    f. Hours/days for deliveries
    g. Erosion control plan
    h. A schedule of work being done on the site and off site and the overall length of construction
    i. Location of the construction fencing and gate on a plan with the crushed stone apron
    j. Traffic Management Plan for utility work
    k. The detour route for vehicles
    l. The route for pedestrians, including any ADA requirements, signage and safety requirements
    m. Construction site plan for barrier, signage including documentation of existing City/State signage that may be impacted by construction activities and will need to be replaced once construction is completed
    n. The following statement should be included in the plan: "Provide the City's traffic engineering 3 business days' notice that construction will begin"
    o. Provide a description of any work being done in the street and provide a TMP to perform this work for approval by the City's traffic engineer.

9. The hours for construction activities and delivery of materials will be as follows:

    7:00 am to 5:00 pm Monday thru Friday
    8:00 am to 4:00 pm Saturday.

    All construction and deliveries shall be prohibited on Sunday unless a different schedule is approved by the Chief of Police.

10. The Post Construction Operation and Maintenance Plan for the Biome tenting facilities, subsurface detention basins, other drainage structures, and site maintenance which includes the ownership and responsible parties shall be recorded at the Norfolk County Registry of Deeds as part of the Planning Board decision.

11. The applicant shall submit to the Planning Board a copy of the recorded Condominium Association Agreement.

12. Upon completion of this project, the applicant shall submit to the Engineering Department and Planning Board as-built plans showing all utilities, building footprints, reference bounds and benchmarks defining the total site, facilities and right of ways. Plans shall be submitted in a digital format acceptable to both Engineering and Planning Departments.

The Chairman asked if there were any further questions from the members of the Planning Board. There were none.

Chairman Richard Meade asked for a motion to approve. Member Maureen Glynn made a motion to approve. Member Sean Callaghan seconded the motion and it was so voted unanimously.

7:29PM **Continued Public Hearing – 661-665, 671 Washington Street – Site Plan/Special Permit - Planning Board Case No. 2016-09** Applicant's Attorney Ed Fleming reiterated the proceedings of the previous Planning Board meeting regarding the project's initial presentation, discussing minimal traffic impact, concerns raised regarding truck access and turning radius, vehicular conflicts at the Washington Street access/egress point, and the Board's request for submittal of a 21E report regarding contaminated soil on-site. The primary concern articulated by the Board, he said, was architectural aesthetics and the City's desire for greater architectural elements responsive to a gateway concept due to its prominent location upon entering the City. Architect Andy Graves described revisions regarding access to the site, including the shifting of 2 parking spaces to allow more room for vehicular queuing by lengthening the driveway, increased plantings with 4 season, visual interest, architectural massing, color, and scale, increased prominence of the tower element, which would be backlit to replicate a lighthouse as a reference to its location in a shipyard. Mr. Graves stated that the redesigned tower element provide more visual interest and acted as a gateway component. He described elements of the redesign, including the cornice, window trim, translucent glass panels, detailing to break-up the building's massing, and the addition of a second lower tower as a corner piece of the rear façade. Detail was added, including warmer material colors in muted earth tones used in the plinth blocks. The Chairman opened the hearing up to questions from the Board. Vice Chairman Barry thanked the project team for responding the Board's comments regarding the need for greater architectural flourishes. Member Comiso inquired about the signage, asking if there would be a single or multiple signs. Mr. Graves answered that there would be 2 signs. Planning Director Fatseas then asked Mr. Graves to repeat his presentation directly to the public so that interested neighbors could get a full understanding of the revisions being proposed. Attorney Fleming stated that the project team had responded thoughtfully to comments and concerns from the City departments and independent Peer Review. Mr. Meade

seconded Mr. Barry's appreciation of the efforts to improve the project according to articulate d issues, and stated that the revisions presented required the opportunity for full review.

Chairman Richard Meade asked for a motion to continue the public hearing to the September 14, 2016 Planning Board meeting. Member Sean Callaghan made a motion to continue. Member Maureen Glynn seconded the motion and it was so voted unanimously. The Chairman opened the hearing to the public for questions and comments. Abutters Eileen Norris Bill Shegaris of 613 South Street and John Rodophele of 62 Grenwold Road expressed their concerns, including their dislike of the aesthetics, saying that the architecture looked like the building was a Walgreen's or the Dedham House of Correction, that the building would block the sun to abutting properties and reduce the property value, problems with drainage, flooding, changing wind patterns, rodents being disturbed as a result of construction, the continued need for the existing boatyard more than another storage facility, the suggestion that turning it into a public amenity such as a park would be a better use of the space because people would go there if there was a reason to, construction deliveries, contaminated soil, child safety issues, inquiry into why the project couldn't be only 2 stories instead of the proposed 4, the size of the signage being too large, the need for a smaller project that won't block abutters sunlight, and that the company's owner would be an out of state instead of local business. Vice Chairman Barry then reminded the public of what a Planning Board is authorized to do, stating that they only have power over the specific process of Site Plan Review and cannot, as part of their authority, dictate what can be built.

8:01 PM **<u>Public Hearing – 23 & 31 Bridge Street – Site Plan/Special Permit - Planning Board Case No. 2016-12</u>** Chairman Meade opened the public hearing, reading the Notice of Public Hearing aloud, as follows: In accordance with the provisions of MGL Chapter 40A, Section 11, the Quincy Planning Board will hold a public hearing on Wednesday, August 24, 2016, at or after 7:00 PM, in the 1st Floor Boards and Commissions Room, Quincy City Hall, 1305 Hancock Street, Quincy, MA, on the application of Boston Property Development, LLC, 125 Greenleaf Street, Quincy, MA 02169, for Site Plan Review under Quincy Zoning Ordinance Title 17, Section 9.5.1 (Site Plan Review) and Special Permit under Sections 5.1.17 (parking waiver) and 5.3.13 (signs). The Applicant proposes the demolition of the existing two-family residential structure and the construction of a new five-story, multifamily residential building consisting of sixty (60) residential units with garage parking under the building for ninety-eight (98) parking spaces. The Applicant also proposes landscaping, drainage and other site modifications. The property contains 30,828+ square feet of land and is located at 23 & 31 Bridge Street. The subject property is located within the Business C Zoning District and is shown on Assessors Map 1156, Lot 4, Plot 2 and Map 1156, Lot 2. Applicant's Attorney Ed Fleming introduced the project team, including Applicant Peter McLaughlin, Architects Dartagnan Brown and Kathryn (name inaudible) of Embarc Studios, Civil Engineer Jim Burke of DeCelle Burke, and Traffic Engineer Jack Gillon. He gave an overview of the project, citing its Business C Zoning District designation as permitting multifamily residences, the developers being a Quincy based company with other developments in the area, the site's existing conditions, and its unique circumstance of potentially sharing a Cultec stormwater

management system with a sister project designed by the same engineer, as well as the project's scheduled hearings before both the Quincy Conservation Commission (ConCom) and Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA). Mr. Brown gave a presentation, which included building massing within the site context, the intention to create a courtyard to provide an enjoyable pedestrian experience, the use of glass and expansive architecture to create a an open space relationship between the interior and exterior, the types and numbers of units, the use of a landscaped green roof and solar panels, a glass ground floor lobby, shielded and subsurface parking, brick elements for a traditional style in respectful relationship to the nearby Peacefield historic home in Adams National Historical Park. Attorney Fleming stated that the project's inclusion in the night's public hearing was for presentation/informational purposes only and that Peer Review and City departmental review were forthcoming. He said that the proposed drainage would improve Furnace Brook and the existing conditions of the site. Mr. Meade asked if the Board had questions. Member Barry inquired if the National Historical site was within view of the building, and what, if any, discussion did the developer have with the National Park Service who runs the site regarding impact on the park. Mr. Fleming responded that he would speak with the park's Superintendent Marianne Peake, who was in attendance at the meeting. The landscape's existing greenspace would not be disturber, Mr. Fleming said. Member Comiso asked if the units would be rentals or condominiums, to which Fleming answered rentals; signage, which he said the location had been identified, but that because the building had not yet been branded there were no signage details; and if the sign would be visible from the Adams Mansion, to which the answer was yes. Mr. Meade asked about the parking spaces and was told there would be 22 surface and 76 underground spaces; the maximum height of the building, to which he was told by Fleming that it was 64' – significantly lower than the nearby Hamilton building which had 12 stories as opposed to this project's proposed 5 stories. Meade then stated that he wanted to see a rendering of the site as seen from the National Historical Park. Member Glynn then opined that the developer needed to pay close attention to the signage because of its relationship to the historic site. Mr. Comiso asked if the existing trees were evergreens to block the building from NPS year-round or if there would winter visibility of the structure. He was told that the trees were deciduous, however it was pointed out that the park's grounds were not open to the public during the cold-weather season, so that screening was not an issue. Mr. Meade then opened the project up to questions or comments from the public. Quincy resident John Rodophele of 62 Grenwold Rd expressed his concerns regarding zoning, population density, inadequacy of lot size and open space, and the proposal's visibility from the Adams Mansion. Rick Doane of Interfaith Social Services located just across the road from the site expressed his concern for inadequate parking, stating that ISS was an emergency food pantry, mental health and counselling centers, and thrift shop that provided valuable services to the public. He was concerned about the parking impact on his busy location. NPS Adams National Historical Park Superintendent Marianne Peake stated that she wanted the opportunity to speak with the developer on how best to serve Quincy residents, the need to be mindful of a compatible relationship to the historic site, cited a nearby building a 999 Hancock St already underway

that was visible from the site, NPS visitors being able to see the building's rooftop mechanicals, overall concern for the changing landscape of development and its impact on the Adams grounds. She said that screening from the subway tracks would be beneficial and wanted them to address pedestrian access and show sensitivity to the Adams house. She then welcomed the public to visit the park for free August 25-28, 2016. Mr. Comiso spoke of the historic nature of Adams Park and seconded Ms. Peake's request to be sensitive to the visual relationship between the proposed building and its historic neighbor. Member Barry asked for a realistic rendering of this visual relationship, and Ms. Glynn stated the need for the developer to pay attention to the roofline visual. Ms. Peake again emphasized that the surrounding skyscape has a real visual impact on Peacefield. Ward 1 City Councillor Margaret LaForest then spoke, stating that she had cohosted a neighborhood meeting in July with City Council President/Ward 5 Councillor Kirsten Hughes. She posed a series of questions, all of which were answered by Attorney Fleming; were the parking requirements met? – yes, there was a surplus; what was the unit size in square feet? – 600-1200sf per unit, depending on type; was the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) satisfied – yes. She also discussed the need for Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) relief for setbacks, the lot area, total lot size, and height of the building, and stated that there were parking concerns for the neighborhood. It was confirmed that the project had public hearings before the Conservation Commission (ConCom) on September 7, 2016 and ZBA on September 13, 2016. She asked what the date would be for a continuation of the project and it was confirmed that the next available Planning Board meeting would be October 12, 2016.
Chairman Richard Meade asked for a motion to continue the public hearing to the October 12, 2016 Planning Board meeting. Member Maureen Glynn made a motion to continue. Member Sean Callaghan seconded the motion and it was so voted unanimously.
Mr. Meade then followed up with a clarification that not all Planning Board members were available to attend the October 12th meeting and there was discussion among the Board and Planning Department by which it was determined that the date of the meeting would be changed to October 19, 2016, to accommodate all members.

8:47 PM **Business Items:** Review and vote on amendment to previously approved Decision - 600R Crown Colony - Site Plan/Special Permit - Planning Board Case No. 2014-01: to eliminate proposed walkway amenity due to public safety concerns and review and vote on City of Quincy Code of Ordinance, Chapter 12.08 – Street and Sidewalk Use Regulations, Section 12.08.170 – Private Street Names – Approval Required: No Private Way in the City shall hereafter be given a name of designation, or any sign board, unless the same is approved by the Planning Board of the City; to rename Private Way to 600R Crown Colony Drive. Fred Keylor of H.W. Moore presented on both business items for 600R Crown Colony Drive modifications. Member Comiso asked if the picnic site would remain as regards the elimination of the public walkway amenity and Mr. Keylor clarified that all other proposed amenities would remain.

Chairman Richard Meade asked for a motion to approve the amended plan. Member Cole Barry made a motion to approve Member Glen Comiso seconded the motion and it was so voted unanimously.
Chairman Richard Meade asked for a motion to approve the renaming of Crown Colony Drive to Crown Drive. Member Sean Callaghan made a motion to approve. Member Cole Barry seconded the motion and it was so voted unanimously.

8:55 PM Member Sean Callaghan made a motion to adjourn. Vice Chairman Coleman Barry seconded the motion and it was so voted unanimously.