PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, May 11, 2022

MEMBERS PRESENT: Richard Meade, Gregory Galvin, Patrick J. Foley, John Kelly, Kimberly Bielan, Larry Liuzzo

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

OTHERS PRESENT: James J. Fatseas, Planning Director
Robert Stevens, Deputy Planning Director
Susan Laracy, Assistant Planner
Joe King, Principal Planner

Due to the Covid-19 National Emergency and in accordance with Chapter 22 of the Acts of 2022 signed by Governor Charles D. Baker on February 2, 2022, extending certain provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A, § 20, this meeting shall not be conducted in an open, publicly accessible place. Instead, public access to the hearing and deliberations shall be achieved by adequate, alternative means that allow the public to follow the Planning Board proceedings in real time: namely, Remote Meeting Access using Zoom Video Communication. Zoom is a third-party communication technology that is readily accessible to the public, but not administered by the City of Quincy.

Meeting called to order at 5:30 PM by Chairman Richard Meade.

5:30PM Roll was taken alphabetically by Assistant Planner Susan Laracy with Planning Board members Bielan, Foley, Galvin, Kelly, Liuzzo and Meade, indicating their presence.

5:30PM Chairman Meade read aloud the modified Open Meeting Law, as follows: “In accordance with the provisions of MGL Chapter 40A, Section 11, the Quincy Planning Board’s public hearing on Wednesday, May 11, 2022, starting at 5:30 PM, is being held remotely and in accordance with Chapter 22 of the Acts of 2022 signed by Governor Charles D. Baker on February 2, 2022, extending certain provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A, § 20. Public access to the hearing and deliberations shall be achieved by using Zoom Video Communication. Zoom is a third-party communication technology that is readily accessible to the public, but not administered by the City of Quincy.

Pursuant to the Open Meeting Law, any person may make an audio or video recording of this public meeting or may transmit the meeting through any medium. Attendees are therefore advised that such recordings or transmissions are being made, whether perceived or unperceived, by those present and are deemed acknowledged and permissible.”
Chairman Meade read aloud the modified Planning Board Meeting General Rules, as follows: “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. Once the Chair opens the meeting for public testimony on a specific case, any person wishing to speak on the matter will need to be recognized by the Meeting Host. To be recognized, please raise hand via the Zoom Meeting Raise Hand option on the computer and you will be unmuted by the Meeting Host to speak. If you are dialing in by phone, please press *9 and wait to be recognized by the Meeting Host. When prompted to speak, please 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, audio-taped, and video-taped for the public record. The Planning Board reserves the right to exclude any unnecessary, irrelevant, repetitive, or harassing presentations.

The Chairman announced he was taking an agenda item out of order.

Public Hearing – City Council Order 2022-051 - Special Districts – Adding “Centre Street Transit Oriented District”
Chairman Meade read into the public record the Notice of Public Hearing and invited City Solicitor James Timmins to speak to the matter. Mr. Timmins explained to the Board that he had been asked by Planning Director James Fatseas to speak to them regarding the proposed City Council Order and noted that there had been some concern expressed about the ambiguity of the proposal’s goals. He said the goal was to create a TOD (Transit Oriented Development) overlay district by rezoning a relatively small section of Centre St at Intervale St. The City, he said, had previously created a TOD district at the North Quincy MBTA Station where more planned development in the area could take advantage of its proximity to the T, and that the option had been left open to create other such districts. He told the Board this proposal was similar but on a much smaller scale. Mr. Timmins described the targeted area as predominantly commercial with some industrial use. As with the previous TOD, the goal of the order was to allow for landowners or developers to create projects that take advantage of their proximity to the Quincy Adams T Station, if the Planning Board issues a positive recommendation to the City Council. The current zoning would remain, he said, and introducing a residential use to the area wouldn’t adversely impact the neighborhood. He clarified that some concern had been expressed regarding the possibility that this proposed zoning change would be beholden to the specific requirements as defined in Governor Baker’s recently released TOD bill and ensured the Board that this proposal was distinct from the Baker legislation. The Massachusetts state Department of Housing and Community Development was developing the regulations which were still being worked on, he said, and the state’s Mayors and Planning & Community Development departments were all working on creating TOD overlay districts for their own municipalities, though he clarified that this proposal was a zoning change and not an application of the broader legislation. Mr. Timmins said it was right to dispose of City owned properties, pointing to one on Intervale St that he said was a 21E mess (Massachusetts General Law Chapter 21E, formally known as the Massachusetts Oil and Hazardous Material Release Prevention and Response Act)
which had suffered clean-up problems. The overlay would work in concert with an RFP (Request for Proposals) as the City was looking for a bidder to clean up and develop the site into something with a constructive use, not for example to simply use it as a construction laydown area. He noted the defined district was surrounded by residential development and the intention was for positive development along Centre St to benefit the area. Chairman Meade opened the hearing to questions from the Board. Vice Chairman Gregory Galvin asked how much time went into defining the area and how the parcels had been selected. He questioned if enough study had been done to make it worthwhile to the City. Mr. Timmins said he couldn’t answer how much time had gone into defining the area, but that City Councilor Palmucci had been working on the proposal for over a year, having used the 2016 development as a precedent. He stated that the Mayor was happy with the parcel selection for developers to improve upon. There were no additional questions from the Board. Chairman Meade explained the Planning Board’s role as relegated to issuing a recommendation to the City Council on their proposed Council Orders. He asked the Solicitor if the Board could recommend adding parcels to the defined area. Solicitor Timmins responded that he didn’t think there would be a problem with adding parcels but there could be some concern about deleting them from the district. He noted the Scrivener’s errors in the Council Order which would need to be corrected. Chairman Meade read into the public record comment letters from Abutters Mirageas and Bramantes, Exhibits A & B respectively. Explaining the Zoom meeting management process and the reason for needing to mute and unmute participants to ensure proper conduct, Deputy Planning Director Rob Stevens opened the hearing for public comment. John Rodophele of 62 Grenwold Rd said that he agreed with Vice Chairman Galvin regarding the addition of parcels and suggested that yet more additional parcels should be considered for the district. He said he thinks it’s a good area for new growth and density but that his concern was for pedestrian safety for those crossing McGrath Highway. He offered that a pedestrian bridge or overpass should be considered. Geoff Mann of Rodman St said he doesn’t want to see anything close to the size of the North Quincy development which he described as huge. He agreed with pedestrian safety concerns noting that there were already frequent accidents in the area. Mr. Mann inquired if this proposal would involve taking current residences to add to the zone.

Chairman Meade asked for a motion to close the matter.

VOTE TO CLOSE
MOTION: by Member John Kelly
SECOND: by Member Patrick J. Foley
Roll was taken alphabetically by Ms. Laracy with Planning Board members Bielan, Foley, Galvin, Kelly, and Meade, indicating their vote to close the matter.
VOTE: All Aye 5-0 Motion Carries.

Vice Chairman Galvin reiterated that he didn’t understand the parcels that had been chosen, saying that the district seemed very cut-up, that it didn’t make sense to him, and he doesn’t think the layout of the district meets the proposal’s goals. Chairman Meade said he would like to see an opportunity to expand the district by adding parcels but clarified that the Board’s role is a non-binding recommendation to the Council. The Vice Chairman asked if the Board had time for the district to be further studied so as to recommend expanding the district with additional parcels. Mr. Timmins said that he understood Mr. Galvin’s concerns but that the City had made a
choice to divest particular parcels of property and had expanded the district out from there. Then the state TOD legislation came down which would suggest pursuing a much bigger district but that this proposal is a limited TOD, and unlike the 2016 TOD which said the district would need a minimum 1-acre parcel, this development would have to assemble parcels to meet such a requirement. A larger TOD district would have to be studied, he said, before addressing Mr. Mann saying this proposal is not going to be too large like the North Quincy development. Mr. Stevens interjected that the Council wanted robust development for the North Quincy TOD and said that that proposal mimics the Urban Renewal District Plan goals of expedited permitting and use, the Board acting as the Special Permit Granting Authority for Certificates of Consistency. The Urban Renewal plan allows for residential use with an overlay district, he said, which encourages the highest and best use of the land. He said that several low-use commercial parcels had been identified for development and that previous study had identified that the surface parking lot at the T was ripe for development and would allow the City to advocate for a pedestrian safety bridge to the site. Mr. Meade said that made sense and he felt the Board should issue a favorable recommendation while suggesting the Council should look at adding parcels.

Chairman Meade asked for a motion to make a recommendation to the City Council

VOTE TO ISSUE A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION
MOTION: by Member John Kelly
SECOND: by Member Kimberly Bielan, with change to the motion to issue a favorable recommendation to presently include the opportunity to further study the district and add additional parcels.

Roll was taken alphabetically by Ms. Laracy with Planning Board members Bielan, Foley, Galvin, Kelly, and Meade, indicating their vote to continue the matter.

VOTE: All Aye 5-0 Motion Carries.

6:09PM Chairman Meade asked for a motion to approve the minutes from March 20, 2022 Special Meeting and April 13, 2022 Regular Meeting, as written.

VOTE TO APPROVE
MOTION: by Vice Chairman Gregory Galvin
SECOND: by Member John Kelly

Ms. Laracy asked for All Aye to Approve with Planning Board members Bielan, Foley, Galvin, Kelly, Liuzzo, and Meade, indicating their vote to approve. Member Liuzzo clarified that he was only voting on the March Meeting Minutes and not the April Meeting Minutes as he was not present at that meeting.

VOTE MARCH MINUTES: All Aye 6-0 Motion Carries
VOTE APRIL MINUTES: All Aye 5-0 Motion Carries

6:11PM Continued Public Hearing – 1562 & 1570 Hancock Street - Planning Board Case No. 2022-CoC-01

Chairman Meade read into the public record the Notice of Public Hearing. Project attorney Dave Mahoney said he wanted to refresh the Board’s memory that the project team had made a presentation before them 60 days prior and that the project had undergone peer review. He introduced applicant Margarita Kvacheva to give a brief overview of the project. She invited
architect David Snell to present the latest revisions, dated May 11th 2022, to the Board. Exhibit C. Mr. Snell showed the locus of the site in context and said that the parking spaces and dimensions had been revised in response to comments provided by the department of Traffic, Parking, Alarm, & Lighting (TPAL). He noted the revisions of the support columns and drive aisle dimensions. Margarita spoke to the building programming and typical floor layouts of the units. She noted that people had said they wanted to know what the amenities would be, and she handed it off to Mr. Snell who said amenities would include a fitness center, common room, coworking spaces and a dog park and described the proposed landscape plan. All the units would have blinds to maintain privacy and would be built for audio privacy as well. Civil engineer Alfons Koka of Highpoint Engineering told the Board that revisions had responded to peer review comments with the major changes being sidewalk improvements with materials to City standards, a drop-off area enlarged to accommodate larger delivery trucks and showed revisions to the Dunford Drive garage exit and the stop sign that had been added to improve pedestrian and vehicular safety. Other revisions included grading dimensions, but the main focus was on the stormwater management system which included adding an area drain, manholes and catch basins, reconciling the drainage, sewer and water connections, and increasing pipe sizes. Mr. Mahoney offered that the City’s independent peer review consultant Woodard & Curran had done a comprehensive analysis and that the team had responded to their review. Member Kelly advocated for the development team to hire local contractors and was told by Margarita that she and her partners have been and continue to be committed to employing local workers. Peer review consultant RJ Dowling of Woodard & Curran said the applicant’s team had done a good job responding to the peer review report that he had issued and to developing the site’s combined City remnant with its 2 private parcels, and with mirroring the landscape plan materials to its surrounding environs. He concluded that the project team had sufficiently responded to working towards all issues being resolved. Mr. Stevens opened the hearing for public comment. Jeff Hines of 197 Elm St said his concerns were downtown parking creeping out into the surrounding residential neighborhoods and rodent control. John Rodophele of 62 Grenwold Rd thanked Mr. Hines for making what he said were valid comments. He asked where the public would be able to read the LDA (Land Disposition Agreement) and stated that he was in favor of the project, wishing the development team good luck. Mr. Stevens stated that the peer review consultant had just issued their supplemental report and that he had asked Mr. Dowling if the project team was heading in the right direction. He was told that while they were heading for a resolution, the conclusion was that due to the complexity of issues that needed to be addressed the Planning Department would need a month to review the outstanding issues in order to prepare a recommendation to the Board.

Chairman Meade asked for a motion to close the matter.

VOTE TO CLOSE
MOTION: by Member John Kelly
SECOND: by Member Patrick J. Foley
Roll was taken alphabetically by Ms. Laracy with Planning Board members Bielan, Foley, Galvin, Kelly, and Meade, indicating their vote to close the matter.
VOTE: All Aye 5-0 Motion Carries.

Chairman Meade asked for a motion to continue the matter to the June 8th meeting.
VOTE TO CONTINUE
MOTION:  by Member John Kelly
SECOND:  by Member Patrick J. Foley
Roll was taken alphabetically by Ms. Laracy with Planning Board members Bielan, Foley, Galvin, Kelly, and Meade, indicating their vote to continue the matter.
VOTE:  All Aye 5-0 Motion Carries.

6:37PM    Continued Public Hearing – 106-108 Franklin Street – Planning Board Case No. 2022-02

Vice Chairman Galvin made a motion to waive the reading of Notice of Public Hearing, which had been read into the public record when the public hearing was opened.

VOTE TO WAIVE
MOTION:  by Vice Chairman Gregory Galvin
SECOND:  by Member John Kelly
A voice vote was taken by Ms. Laracy with Planning Board members Bielan, Foley, Galvin, Kelly and Meade, indicating their vote to waive.
VOTE:  All Aye 5-0 Motion Carries.

Project attorney Patrick Foley told the Board the main changes in the revised plans were a reduction in the number of units down from 46 to 40, and an increase in the number of parking spaces from 70 to 73, with 2 commercial spaces being provided. Architect Brian Donahue presented the architectural plans, Exhibit D, giving an overview of the existing conditions and modifications to the retail spaces and 6 new duplex apartment units. He showed changes to the floor plans and said that a basement had been developed strictly to house the building’s utilities. There would be no entries into the commercial spaces from Payne St, the archway had been eliminated and 6 designated commercial parking spaces had been assigned. The drop-off space had also been eliminated as the proposed design necessitated encroachment onto private property, which he said was not City policy. Mr. Donahue clarified that the proposed roof decks would be private and solely for use of the units with no connection to the commercial spaces and no restaurant use. He introduced project civil engineer Rick Salvo. The hearing was opened to questions from the Board. Member Kimberly Bielan asked for confirmation that the units would be condominiums and was told by Mr. Donahue they would be. Vice Chairman Galvin pointed to the existing hydrant on North Payne St not showing on the architectural plans and asked why the commercial spaces had a brick façade as they seemed out of place with the existing commercial spaces. Mr. Donahue replied that hydrants are typically shown on civil engineering plans and that brick-face was used to differentiate the commercial spaces from the residential ones. Mr. Salvo presented the civil plans showing the hydrant. The hearing was opened to for public comment. There was none. The City’s independent peer review consultant, Steve Giolosa of Civil & Environmental Consultants (CEC) presented his analysis stating that stormwater management was his main concern. Soil samples revealed good drainage, but the water calculations needed to be updated, he said. Regarding the elimination of the drop-off area, he deferred to the Board and the City. Mr. Giolosa said the sightlines, traffic data and turning movements were all adequate and needed to be included in the final traffic report, the ramp
reconstruction needs to comply with ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) standards and access to the dog park needs to be defined. There were no further questions from the Board or the public.

Chairman Meade asked for a motion to close the public hearing.

VOTE TO CLOSE
MOTION: by Member John Kelly
SECOND: by Member Patrick J. Foley
Roll was taken alphabetically by Ms. Laracy with Planning Board members Bielan, Foley, Galvin, Kelly, and Meade, indicating their vote to close the matter.
VOTE: All Aye 5-0 Motion Carries.

Mr. Stevens addressed the issue of the drop-off area saying that the department had received comments from the DPW and TPAL and confirmed that no public sidewalks could be located on private land. Concern was expressed about the loading area resulting in delivery trucks traveling further down North Payne St to exit the area and there would be follow up on this with an updated traffic report. He said all outstanding issues would need to be addressed with final documentation prior to the issuance of a building permit. He read the Planning Departments recommendations to the Board. Exhibit E. There were no questions from the Board regarding the recommendations.

Chairman Meade asked for a motion to approve based on the Planning Department’s recommendations.

VOTE TO APPROVE
MOTION: by Member John Kelly
SECOND: by Member Kimberly Bielan
Roll was taken alphabetically by Ms. Laracy with Planning Board members Bielan, Foley, Galvin, Kelly, and Meade, indicating their vote to approve.
VOTE: All Aye 5-0 Motion Carries.

7:07PM Continued Public Hearing – 29-31 Newcomb Street - Planning Board Case No. 2022-04
Chairman Meade read into the public record the Notice of Public Hearing. Project attorney Kathleen Heyer introduced herself as representing applicant Steve Niosi. She presented the revised plans for the 5-story 24-unit proposal explaining that a larger project had previously been submitted and the revisions had been made after the Notice of Public Hearing had been sent out to abutters with the original narrative of 28 units. She said that the project site was located in a Business C Zoning District and told the Board that it will need relief from the ZBA (Zoning Board of Appeals). She gave a presentation of the proposal, Exhibit F, touting Quincy as a Gateway City and Federal Opportunity Zone with the characteristics to provide multi-family housing. She described the site as an existing nonconforming use close to both the subway and to bus routes and said that increased multimodal options could result in a decrease in cars so that the proposal only needed a 1:1 parking ratio. Parking, she said, is a main concern for the neighbors expressed at a recent community meeting and the applicant is willing to offer multiple
transportation options to residents to mitigate the potential for the inadequate parking ratio. She said the site received from FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency) a Letter of Map Amendment (LOMA) with respect to the floodplain issues and said that a number of engineering studies had been performed of the site with previous applications. Ms. Heyer introduced the project’s civil engineer Karlis Skulte of CEC and architect Tim Johnson. Mr. Skulte told the Board the revisions had responded to peer review comments. Existing conditions, he said, were that the area was subject to localized flooding, located within a FEMA flood zone, had been issued a LOMA for the existing structure and that this had been factored into the design of the project. The revisions had added detail and clarification of the stormwater management and utilities plans, ZBA relief needed and traffic flow. He showed a circular garage entrance and expanded loading area to better accommodate truck maneuvering for trash management and deliveries. The stormwater management system consisted of trench drains, water quality units and swales to capture runoff from the paved drive aisles and recharge into the ground water. Utilities included water/sewer pipes, drainage basins, electrical and telecommunication. DPW had requested he reconfirm the water main connection. Mr. Skulte described the landscaped screening at the rear to act as a buffer and a retaining wall with screening fencing atop on the east and west sides of the site. The construction management, rodent control, environmental and demolition plans would all be coordinated with the City, he said. Mr. Johnson said the setbacks and height of the proposed building conform to ordinance regulations. He presented architectural plans showing the ground to top floor elevator, the incorporation of existing granite walls into the landscape plan, a shadow study, and recycling and waste management receptacles located on the southeast side of the garage. Revisions, he said, included an increased drop-off area, enlarged garage doors, a numbered parking space assigned to each unit, ADA accessible parking space and one-way traffic pattern which enters the site on the southeast and exits on the northwest side. Showing a typical floor plan, he gave a breakdown of units: 20 2-bedrooms at approximately 1000-1282 square feet and 4 3-bedroom units at approximately 1324-1373 square feet. He said all units would have balconies and the top floor units would have roof decks. A spiral staircase would provide roof access from the uppermost floor. Architectural materiality consisted of fiber cement lap siding, brick, anodized aluminum cladding on the mansard roof and fiberglass windows built to the Stretch Energy Code. The hearing was opened for the Board’s comments. Member Kimberly Bielan asked if there was no provision for guest parking and, as there is no street parking available, wondered where visitors would park. She also wished to know if the units would be apartments or condos. Attorney Heyer retorted that public parking was available nearby but that she was still working on the parking plan and hoped that some people who moved in would have no cars. Ms. Bielan noted there appeared to be a conflict with large trash or recycling trucks negotiating the driveway/loading area and the lower story balcony overhangs. Mr. Skulte said he would confirm with the waste management company their truck size, but Ms. Bielan asked about other trucks such as moving trucks or FedEx. Mr. Johnson stated the lower balconies had a 10-foot clearance and to avoid conflict he would pull the 2nd floor balconies flush with the building. Ms. Bielan stated the trash management seemed insufficient and offered that landscaping on both sides of the property was needed. Vice Chairman Gregory Galvin opined that the loading dock was a problem, saying the need to back up and maneuver the sharp corner wouldn’t work. He suggested that a trash truck wouldn’t bother to use it and will stay on the street, thereby creating a blockade. He asked how fire trucks would access the site. Member Patrick J. Foley concurred with the previous observations regarding the trash truck and maneuverability. Chairman Richard Meade asked if both ZBA and ConCom (Conservation
Commission) relief was being sought. Ms. Heyer offered that the proposal was undersized for multi-family use, noted the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) and Open Space and told the Chairman that she had not yet sought relief from ConCom but acknowledged she would need to do so. Chairman Meade said the building was too big and too tightly situated on the site and that traffic circulation is a nightmare. Member Larry Liuzzo agreed with the Chairman that the proposed building was too large for the lot and asked for clarification on the bedroom breakdown which Mr. Johnson then reiterated. Chairman Meade read into the public record comment letters from Abutters Blanchard and Campbell, respectively. Exhibits G & H. Mr. Stevens opened the hearing for public comment. Steve Halvochek of 11 Francis Ave said he was pleased with the Planning Board’s questions and that abutter comment letters had been submitted. He said while the site is zoned Business C the neighborhood is overwhelmingly residential 1 and 2-family houses. He said that developers need to meet Business C zoning requirements at least and that there shouldn’t be variances, overrides and exceptions for proposals that don’t meet them. He said the applicant is trying to jam a huge monstrosity into a small space that is not in keeping with the feel of the neighborhood and that the project is a mess. Steve Christo of Standish Ave said he supports the project and thinks it’s more positive than negative in its impact, saying that the reduction in the carbon footprint is a positive. He liked that its close proximity to public transportation would encourage multimodal forms of travel and thought it was good for the City, for Quincy Center and for the area. Nancy Rudillo of 32 Newcomb St expressed her concerns for the building height, inadequate parking, snow removal and flooding. She said the driveway and balconies face her home and was concerned about headlights shining through her windows and loud parties causing a noise disturbance. She was also concerned about traffic issues including deliveries causing obstructions on the street and pedestrian safety – noting that the existing conflict between vehicular traffic and students traveling from the high school was already a problem. Jeff Hines of 197 Elm St thanked Mr. Stevens for trying to get the rodent control issue in hand. He said he agreed with the Board’s comments on the project and wished to know if it was possible for the applicant to get a permit if they already have one for the property Mr. Stevens told him the inquiry would need to be conferred with the Inspectional Services Department. Mr. Hines wondered if the applicant did get a permit what would happen to abutting properties that were part of the previous proposal. He concluded that parking was a huge issue. Tom Stansbury of 32 Newcomb St said the latest proposal had all the same issues as the previous proposals before it. He said it needs to be downsized to fit the neighborhood. John Rodophele of 62 Grenwold Rd had issues with the turning maneuver and number of parking spaces and said he didn’t understand why they are still talking about this proposal and that it needs to be revised and resubmitted so that it will be a better plan. Mr. Halvochek interjected showing a chart with dimensional requirements for the zoning district, which he said showed how out of compliance the project is with the ordinances. Mr. Stevens gave the Board an overview of the project case load that would need to be managed in considering the date for continuing the public hearing and about possibly revising the approved meeting schedule to accommodate Board Members’ summer schedules. Vice Chairman Galvin suggested giving the applicant ample time to make the necessary revisions to make the project feasible because, he said, in its current incarnation he cannot support the proposal with this much relief needed and because it doesn’t meet the Site Plan criteria. Chairman Meade suggested to continue the matter to the July meeting. Member Bielan asked if it needed to be continued to a date certain or could it just be continued to July with date to be determined? Member Galvin clarified that if there was no date certain the continued public hearing for the project would need to be advertised. Chairman Meade concurred
with previous comments and asked if the proponent had anything to say. Mr. Johnson reiterated some of the project dimensions and said the building meets zoning requirements and read aloud the Business C Zoning District regulations. Mr. Stevens added that the parking and drive aisles did not meet the requirements. Attorney Heyer stated that her client would prefer a continuance to the June 8th meeting but deferred to the wishes of the Board. The Chairman asked for the wishes of the Board saying he didn’t want to bring the public out for a meeting only to have the revised project not ready to be presented. Mr. Johnson suggested his office’s ability to present at the June 8th meeting would be an aggressive timeline.

**Member Kelly made a motion to continue the application to the July meeting.**
Chairman Meade noted the July meeting date was as yet to be discussed as a Business Item. Mr. Stevens offered that the July meeting had been scheduled for the 13th but that there would be further discussion about possibly revising the meeting schedule. The other tack for consideration would be that the application could be readvertised as per Member Bielan’s inquiry. He then suggested taking a recess to discuss the schedule. The Chairman concurred with the suggestion to recess to address the matter of the schedule to provide a date certain.

8:23PM **Member John Kelly rescinded his previous motion and made a motion to recess the public hearing on 29-31 Newcomb Street to discuss the schedule.**

**VOTE TO RECESS**
**MOTION:** by Member John Kelly  
**SECOND:** by Vice Chairman Gregory Galvin  
Voice vote was taken by Ms. Laracy with Planning Board members Bielan, Foley, Galvin, Kelly and Meade, indicating their vote to recess the matter.  
**VOTE:** All Aye 5-0 Motion Carries.

8:24PM **Deputy Planning Director Rob Stevens took a Business Item out of order.**
- **Old Business** – 2022 Planning Board Meeting Schedule.

Mr. Stevens addressed the issue of the need to confirm the July meeting date. He explained to the Board that the Planning Department had discussed the possible need to revise the meeting schedule to accommodate the Members’ summer schedules and best manage project flow. He said there had been some consideration to move the July meeting date from the 13th to the 20th or to cancel the July meeting altogether and move the August meeting date from the 10th to the 3rd.

**Member John Kelly made a motion to move the August 10th meeting to the 3rd and cancel July meeting.**

**VOTE TO APPROVE SCHEDULE CHANGES**
**MOTION:** by Member John Kelly  
**SECOND:** by Member Patrick J. Foley  
Roll was taken by alphabetically by Ms. Laracy with Planning Board members Bielan, Foley, Galvin, Kelly, Liuzzo and Meade, indicating their vote to approve scheduling changes.  
**VOTE:** All Aye 6-0 Motion Carries.
8:31PM    Chairman Meade asked for a motion to call the public hearing back in session.

**VOTE TO REOPEN PUBLIC HEARING**
**MOTION:** by Member John Kelly
**SECOND:** by Vice Chairman Gregory Galvin
Voice vote was taken by Ms. Laracy with Planning Board members Bielan, Foley, Galvin, Kelly and Meade, indicating their vote to reopen the matter.
**VOTE:** All Aye 5-0 Motion Carries.

Chairman Meade asked for a motion to continue the matter to the August 3rd meeting.

**VOTE TO CONTINUE**
**MOTION:** by Member John Kelly
**SECOND:** by Member Patrick J. Foley
Voice vote was taken by Ms. Laracy with Planning Board members Bielan, Foley, Galvin, Kelly and Meade, indicating their vote to continue.
**VOTE:** All Aye 5-0 Motion Carries.

8:32PM    **BUSINESS MEETING:**

  There was no discussion of updates.

8:33PM    Chairman Meade asked for motion to adjourn the May 11, 2022 meeting.

**VOTE TO ADJOURN**
**MOTION:** by Member John Kelly
**SECONDED:** by Member Patrick J. Foley
**VOTE:** 5-0 All Aye