

2018 JUL 24 A 10:34

City of Everett

PLANNING BOARD
484 BROADWAY
EVERETT, MA 02149

Frederick Cafasso-*Chairman*
Nancy Koury
Anthony Medeiros
Leo Pizzano, Jr.
Michael O'Connor



Speaker George Keverian Room
3rd Floor - City Hall
2nd & 4th Mondays
7:00 pm

Jeannie Vitukevich - Clerk

MINUTES Planning Board Meeting June 25, 2018

- I. **Roll Call of Members:** Frederick Cafasso, Nancy Koury, Michael O'Connor and Leo Pizzano, Jr. were present. Anthony Medeiros was absent.

Representing the Planning Department: Executive Director, Tony Sousa, Clerk Jeannie Vitukevich, Senior Planner Michael Vivaldi, Building Commissioner James Soper and Special Council Jonathan Silverstein, Esq. and Robin Stein, Esq., both of KP Law.

II. Public Hearing

1. Zoning Amendment – City of Everett – Industrial District

M. Vivaldi explained the purpose of the zoning amendment is intended to rezone the industrial district to the business district.

L. Pizzano made a motion to make a positive recommendation for the City Council to adopt a zoning amendment for the Industrial District along Revere Beach Parkway to the Business District. N. Koury seconded the motion. Motion carries 4-0-0.

2. Zoning Amendment – City of Everett – Commercial Triangle Economic Dev. District

Mai Luo of Kendall Capital and owner of the property at 191 Revere Street, spoke of parking requirements and proposed uses within the new Commercial Triangle zoning district.

M. Luo explained that the proposed parking requirements appear to be too rigid and society seems to be going in the direction of reducing vehicle ownership; therefore requesting the Board to reduce the parking requirements for the above stated reasons.

M. Luo requests that the Board reconsider to allow self-storage 'Uses' within the new proposed Commercial Triangle District. There will be increasing need for self-storage in the future. He

went to explain self-storage has very few employees and can be good neighbors and good property owners.

Anthony Rossi supports the proposed new zoning district, it will be good for the City of Everett; elaborated that the proposed dimensional regulations are good, but more specifically to the height of buildings will work at the proposed 70 feet. In order to redevelopment the existing properties, the zoning will have to work for the future developers.

William Gear, 146 Third Street, supports the zoning amendment and is in favor of the new zoning.

Fire Chief Tony Carli elaborated that the Everett Fire trucks can reach a height of 70 feet and therefore supports the proposed zoning ordinance for the Commercial Triangle.

L. Pizzano commented that each new building should provide storage for the residents on site for each property. M. Luo responded that 50% of the users for self-storage is for residents, but also 50% of the users for self-storage is used by commercial owners.

There was discussion why Everett has very few condominiums in lieu of the apartments; Anthony Rossi explains that there is little to no market for condominiums in the current economic market. L. Pizzano references Brittany Place on the Malden / Everett line; L. Pizzano believed it sold out quickly and believes it is good for the diversity of housing to have condos in the market.

- L. Pizzano began discussing the proposed recommended changes to the new zoning ordinance:
- Drive-throughs
 - Front Yard Setbacks
 - Rear Yard Setbacks – 15 to 25 rear yard
 - Height of the buildings; recommends limiting any structures on the roof to only elevator overrides / headhouse not to exceed 12 feet tall, limit of 12-feet for occupiable and mechanical structures on the roof of buildings.
 - Open Space – recommends open space be defined to surfaces on the ground, with the terminology 'land area'.
 - Visitor parking – Should be a requirement for minimum visitor parking. Some uses versus other uses tend to have more demand for visitor parking along with its proximity to public transit.

N. Koury added how ride-share vehicles often que, so there needs to be sufficient space to que 15 minutes for drop off and pick up area, visitors and loading.

J. Silverstein explained that design review will be required as part of Site Plan; if there is flexible standards as designed through the Site Plan, then it would result in a better project.

J. Soper explained that the MA Building Code states decorative structures on the roof are not limited, but habitable spaces / amenities could be limited to set area; such as 12 feet.

L. Pizzano recommends front yard setbacks be increased to 10 feet for commercial / mixed-use and 15 feet for strictly residential uses.

Rear Yard setbacks be increased to 20 feet. There was discussion regarding the 'flexibility of design' for the future redevelopments. Gathering spaces are generally utilized where there is

sun and shade mixture. The green spaces should be lighted, shaded and have sunlight. The open space requirement of 15% must be at ground level.

Visitor parking / guest parking is addressed within Section 30.7 – Parking, which reads ‘*One off-street parking space marked as visitor parking for every 10 parking spaces.*’

L. Pizzano made a motion for a positive recommendation for City Council to adopt the proposed Commercial Triangle zoning ordinance ‘*Section 33*’ with one (1) amendment to the proposed ‘*Dimensional Regulations*’ that amend the second sentence of Section 33.G.5 to read as follows:

“Other structures on the roof shall not count towards the height unless the area of such structures exceed thirty-three (33) percent of the area of the roof or any enclosed structure or mechanical equipment exceeds twelve feet in height.”

N. Koury seconded the motion. All members were in favor of the motion; motion carried 4-0-0.

3. Zoning Amendment – City of Everett – Section 32 - Inclusionary Zoning

Atty. J. Silverstein commented that the Planning Department has further discussion with other stakeholders and taking the comments from the June 11, 2018 Planning Board meeting, for these reasons, the Planning Department is not prepared to make a recommendation to the Planning Board.

J. Soper commented that he would like the Planning Board to open the discussion to the audience.

Anthony Rossi explained that the City is struggling to redevelop properties partly due to the high affordable housing percentage requirement and potentially high acquisition costs for the land and many properties in Everett need environmental remediation; while some of the abutting cities and towns do not currently have an Inclusionary Zoning requirement and may find the cost of land to be less. A. Rossi gave an example of developer he knows that is starting a new development in Revere due to some of the reasons stated above. While 10% is the state mandate for housing stock, I believe in order to promote Everett, the affordable housing percentages should be closer to 5% to incentivize the redevelop of properties when construction costs are taken into affect. He went on to explain even though Everett is below the state mandate of 10%, it is unlikely that a 40B development would develop in Everett due to the land acquisition and environmental remediation issues, which will limit the already reduced profit margin for 40B projects.

Kathleen O’Brien, 42 Wyllis Ave., explained that she met with the Planning Department recently as she represents housing advocates for Everett; we all want to have more affordable housing in Everett, but Inclusionary Zoning is not the only way to achieve that point. She believes the City does not really know all the ‘needs’ of Everett residents. Maybe a ‘Affordable Housing or Anti-Displacement Taskforce’ with many different stakeholders could be two alternatives to help the residents, too. We don’t know all the facts to this point. We would like to suggest to look at other options, such as promoting lower affordability such as targeting households that are at the 30% AMI level instead of the typical 80% AMI to truly meet lower income residents. We believe there is a big gap in the information. How many affordable housing units / marketrate units does the City need?

K. O’Brien commented that the City of Everett currently has the lowest SHI percentage of the 9 communities in the ‘Healthy Neighborhood study area’, while some of the adjacent communities do not have inclusionary zoning, those same communities do have higher SHI percentages and

some are exceed the state mandate of 10%. This conversation should include many different stakeholders.

Mai Luo, commented that Everett needs affordable housing, but also a good balance which will make the financing work to help redevelop Everett properties. Currently, construction costs and acquisition costs are continuing to rise, so it is making it more difficult to redevelop.

K. O'Brien commented that CHAPA has developed an 'Inclusionary Zoning Toolkit' which can help Everett find its right mix. CHAPA is also engaging municipalities to work with municipalities to find 'its sweetspot' of affordable housing. She strongly suggests the City work with CHAPA to develop this application.

L. Pizzano made a motion to continue the public hearing for zoning amendment to July 23, 2018 at 7:00 pm; N. Koury seconded the motion. All members were in favor of the motion.

III. New Business -

- **Request Site Plan Endorsement for 99 Bow Street – DAG Realty Trust**

M. Vivaldi read the correspondence letter from the applicant's representative requesting endorsement of the Site Plan for 99 Bow Street, M. Vivaldi explained that the applicant explained the conditional requirements for 'Prior to Endorsement'. There is a condition that the 'Taking' for the roadway improvements along Beacham and Robin be completed, there was discussion of the Board's flexibility of endorsing the 'Plans' prior to the 'Taking' being completed by the two parties, DAG Realty Trust and Wynn Casino Group. The Planning Board reviewed the revised architectural elevations for the new proposed building, the building will be a combination of glass, metal panels, concrete and vertical metal siding. The Planning Board agreed to the architectural changes. There was discussion of whether the Planning Board would agree to modify the Site Plan as the condition #9 of the Site Plan decision was not completed; Paul Delory introduced himself and explained that the applicant would be willing to agree to the City not issuing the 'Building Permit' until the specific 'Taking' Plan has been submitted and recorded. The attorney expressed the applicant is wishing to get the Site Plan endorsed so that they can submit the 'Plan' for the bidding process.

Atty. J. Silverstein explained it is better not to modify the Site Plan as it requires a public hearing, so it is better for the Board to take a vote to endorse the Site Plan 'Contingent on Condition #9 being satisfied by the applicant.

L. Pizzano made a motion to endorse the Site Plan for 99 Bow Street subject to Condition #9 being fully satisfied prior to the applicant obtaining the Building Permit; the motion was seconded by N. Koury, all members were in favor of the motion.

- **Request Site Plan Endorsement of 27 Carter Street – ACS Group c/o Mucio Aquino**

P. Delory explained that the Planning Board granted approval in March 2016, now the applicant is seeking endorsement of the Site Plan. Additionally, P. Delory is requesting the Planning Board extend the Site Plan decision for one year until July 2019. P. Delory explained the project involves the construction of six (6) townhouses at 27 Carter Street.

L. Pizzano made a motion to extend the Site Plan decision for 27 Carter Street, N. Koury seconded the motion, all members were in favor of the motion to extend the Site Plan deadline until July 2019.

L. Pizzano made a motion to endorse the Site Plan for 27 Carter Street, N. Koury seconded the motion, all members were in favor to endorse the Site Plan.

- **Request to modify Site Plan decision - 1901 Revere Beach Parkway - Bill Guzowski**

The applicant's contractor is requesting additional time during the construction activity so the contractor may have additional time to finish the concrete pouring and 'burn' the concrete, too.

The contract requires the contractor to work 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM therefore the applicant's contractor is requesting until the end of July 2018 for the additional construction operation of construction hours 7:00 AM to 8:00 PM.

L. Pizzano, Jr. said he understands where they are coming from because concrete is hard to pour with the weather.

L. Pizzano made a motion to modify the Site Plan decision to conform to the construction schedule only for the concrete pour and timing as requested. N. Koury seconded the motion, all members were in favor.

- **Request to extend Site Plan decision deadline for 68 Main Street – Zeyad Odeh**

M. Vivaldi read the applicant's letter requesting to extend the Site Plan decision for 68 Main Street for a year.

The applicant was present and answered questions of the Planning Board and elaborated for the reasons to extend the Site Plan decision deadline.

L. Pizzano made a motion to extend the Site Plan decision deadline for one calendar year until July 2019, N. Koury seconded the motion, all members were in favor of the motion to extend the Site Plan decision.

IV. Old Business –

V. Approval of Meeting Minutes -

L. Pizzano made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of June 11, 2018. N. Koury seconded the motion and all members were in favor of the motion to approve the meeting minutes.

VI. Director's Updates – None

VII. Adjournment -

L. Pizzano made a motion to adjourn the Planning Board meeting . M. O'Connor seconded the motion and all members were in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 9:35 pm

Approved by Planning Board: July 23, 2018

Signatures:



Fred Cafasso
Chairman
Everett Planning Board



Michael Vivaldi, AICP
Senior Planner
Department of Planning and Development

RECEIVED
CITY CLERKS OFFICE
EVERETT, MA
2018 JUL 24 A 10:34