

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

RECEIVED
CITY CLERKS OFFICE
EVERETT, MA
AUG 21 P 3:50

Jeannie Vitukevich - Clerk

MINUTES Planning Board Meeting July 23, 2018

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

Representing the Planning Department: Executive Director, Tony Sousa, Senior Planner Michael Vivaldi, Building Commissioner James Soper and Special Counsel Jonathan Silverstein, Esq. of KP Law.

II. Public Hearing

1. Zoning Amendment – Temporary Parking – Lower Broadway Econ. Dev. District

Present in Interest - Al Carrier, Wynn Development, Project Manager
Dirk Grotenhuis, P.E, of AECOM
Jacqui Krum, Massachusetts Properties, LLC, Legal Counsel
John Tocco, Encore Boston Harbor, Director of Municipal Relations

D. Grotenhuis explained as the applicant, Massachusetts Properties, LLC, is seeking to provide temporary parking which is not currently allowed in the LBED District. The purpose of the temporary parking will provide transition parking while the public becomes knowledgeable to travel to and from the resort casino, the temporary parking will provide overflow parking for the casino. Massachusetts Properties, LLC has purchased several properties in the vicinity of the resort casino and until all the mode shifts are fully operational, the temporary parking will be beneficial to casino to alleviate parking demands in the neighborhood. The existing uses will be demolished and the temporary paved parking lots will be landscaped, lighted and provide Stormwater drainage and the temporary parking will be open to the public will assist to reduce the parking demands for the resort casino. The temporary parking will also reduce the demand for those people who might otherwise drive around looking for parking spaces and potential park in the Lower Broadway neighborhood, which is not advantageous for anyone. The parking will also allow the more of the public to visit the Harbor Walk which might not happen without

the temporary parking. D. Grotenhuis explained the existing businesses have approximately 500 parking spaces throughout the all the combined lots, of those businesses, there were about 1,000 trips generated per day; explained that temporary parking is intended for supplemental parking while the resort casino becomes fully occupied.

F. Cafasso questioned the applicant if they had a map to outline the area in question.

J. Tocco spoke about how the Encore has purchased land for future development, instead of letting the land lay fallow until the owner is ready to redevelop/ utilize the property, they will improve the area with landscaping and lighting for the temporary parking lot. The next phase of this land will have to return to the Planning Board for Site Plan Review for review of the stormwater drainage. As a component of the temporary parking is intended for designated 'ride-share' lots so that those drivers will not be driving around Everett, Chelsea and/or Charlestown. It will provide a second parking option for the public. The temporary parking lot will be open to the public for a nominal fee, however, the fees are yet to be determined.

L. Pizzano questioned how the owner will discourage the commuter parking to occur? J. Tocco responded that it is not intended to be an alternative for commuter parking to Boston. So, the applicant will do all it can to discourage 'commuter' parking on this lot. At no point will Encore develop a fee structure to make it feasible for the commuter parking, it will likely be expensive if they choose to do so.

J. Silverstein explained that the purpose is intended for the public to have free short-term parking for the amenities / water-front park, approximately 2 hours, and then create a much higher fee for long-term parking. A low short-term parking structure and then the fees will increase thereafter.

D. Grotenhuis explained that the 'peak' parking demand will be community open parking lot to reduce the 'peak' traffic demands at the 'Opening' of the casino and the first 3-6 months that it is open.

L. Pizzano questioned how the applicant will manage the large amounts of people crossing Broadway at the street level? Commented that during the original Site Plan Review in 2013 (?) Is it planned to construct a walkway over Broadway to properly manage the large number of people crossing at the street level? He expressed a strong intent for the Board to view the traffic improvement plans to understand the traffic management plans for the two-way pedestrian traffic.

J. Tocco explained that this questioned can best be answered through the Site Plan Review process. D. Grotenhuis explained that the traffic lights will have pedestrian signals for the street crossing.

Al Carrier explained that the current roadway improvement plans are progressing forward; the primary focus is for all the improvements to be completed prior to the end of the construction schedule, they are collaborating with Boston Transportation Department and Everett Planning Department will be viewed by both communities to reduce problems. Between the two communities, they will resolve any problems that arise.

The long term plan for pedestrian crossings is intended to build a pedestrian bridge, but not until future buildings are designed and permitted with major infrastructure improvements. We agree to keep people up and off of Broadway, but not until the many years from now.

N. Koury questions the applicant in terms of pedestrian safety; she believes there is a real concern of pedestrian safety. She questions the future speed limit along Broadway; D. Grotenhuis responded that it will be posted 35 m.p.h. J. Tocco elaborates about the large volumes of construction workers currently crossing Broadway, today.

D. Grotenhuis explained all the pedestrian safety improvements that will be implemented as part of the transportation improvements along the whole roadway corridor.

J. Krum introduced herself and explained what they are proposing now, as they get adjusted to their mode splits, there may be some overflow and they want to account for that overflow. No new construction nor vehicles are being proposed, the casino just wants to accommodate the surplus parking in anticipation of the opening of the resort casino in June 2019. She elaborated it is only meant to be temporary measure, the land is way too expensive to have a parking lot. We recognize the reality and want to make certain that vehicles are not parking in the neighborhood of Lower Broadway. There will be an increased level of visitors at the opening.

D. Grotenhuis explains that the ride-share lot is anticipated off of Robin Street, which would be the back side of the temporary parking lot.

J. Krum commented that an impetus for the temporary parking lot is the opening of the National Harbor in Washington, D.C. Her Team attended the opening to see how they handled the increased activity.

N. Koury questioned the applicant how they will manage the new pedestrians who is not familiar with the volume and speed of vehicles on Broadway. J. Krum responded that the transportation improvements plans have a lot of safety measures built into the roadway improvements. Pedestrians will be funneled / directed through the future parking lot and then only cross at Dexter and Broadway.

Anthony Medeiros questioned how they will go forward. A. Carrier explained how they will phase the construction of the new parking lot. As they proceed forward, there will be less and less construction workers; construct the parking lot in different phases to accommodate the existing construction workers.

D. Grotenhuis explained that in the next phase of development plans will present much more detailed plans which provide 12-foot wide sidewalks in the interior of the parking lot.

Councilor M. McLaughlin commented that the applicant is making a 'good faith' stipulation for 36 months so the parking lot is not permanent and he appreciates the applicants' effort to accommodate the increased vehicles that are anticipated at the opening and beyond; the temporary parking lot will help alleviate the large volume of visitor vehicles that will likely come and prevent the vehicles from parking on the streets of Ward 6 that he represents. He supports this petition and feels it will benefit the Lower Broadway neighborhood.

L. Pizzano questioned the ability of another different property owner in LBEDD proposing a temporary parking lot, can another property do the same as this proposal. J. Silverstein responded to the question that this is proposed as a Special Permit, which is a discretionary

permit with this Board. Section 30.5.C – the zoning currently allows ‘Off-Site Temporary Parking’ which requires:

- No money be charged, which is not desirable so to limit commuter parking.
- Accessory use to an Off-Site Primary Use within 0.25 mile.

Therefore, this concept is preferable to the current zoning and as a reminder, the Planning Board will be the Special Permit Granting Authority.

L. Pizzano made a motion to make a positive recommendation to the City Council to adopt the zoning amendment to allow by Special Permit Temporary Parking Facilities not to exceed 36-months for the Lower Broadway Economic Development District. A. Medeiros seconded the motion. Motion carries 5-0-0.

2. Site Plan Review – 39 Rover Street – NSTAR Electric Company d/b/a Eversource

Present in Interest - Mary Kate Schneeweis, Beals and Thomas
Josh Creelman, Eversource
John Zicko, Eversource
John Hoey, Eversource
Nicole Bowen, Eversource

M. Schneeweis introduced the project background and location, explained the site is 66-acre property located on Alford Street in Boston and Rover Street in Everett, MA. The proposal includes replacing the existing fence will be opaque fence with varying colors and vary in height from 10 feet to 20-feet to provide greater screening and a. The proposal will not impact City water nor sewer. Of the total fence replacement, there is a total of 2,751 linear feet in Everett and 1,667 linear feet in Boston.

F. Cafasso questioned the exact locations of the different height variations of the fence. M. Schneeweis responded by illustrating to the Board with a map of the facility, explained along Alford Street will be 20-feet, 15-feet along Rover Street, and a 10-feet .

L. Pizzano questioned the materials made of the fencing? The applicant responded that the fence is metallic panels that are powder coated. L. Pizzano questioned whether the fencing can be replaced in the future with relatively ease.

L. Pizzano questioned whether the structural / geotechnical analysis has been researched to withstand strong gale force winds, such as a hurricane winds..

N. Koury questioned whether there are locations within a relative proximity for the Board to see first-hand.

Anthony Medeiros questioned whether there will be landscaping and lighting of the area. J. Creelman commented that there are two areas of security fence that will be installed, the applicant will not change the lighting for the area.

N. Koury questioned the ‘glare component’ / finish of the fence, in terms of ‘Matte or Gloss’ to understand the future reflective glare of the fencing. The applicant responded that they will commit to a ‘Matte’ finish if the Board agrees.

T. Sousa commented to the applicant requesting additional information:

- Greater detail of the landscaping plan along Alford Street; a landscaping plan was not submitted within the original submittal.
- Structural stability of the proposed fence in terms of withstanding strong winds.
- Details of how the fence will be installed related to the foundation of the fence.
- Long-term maintenance plan for the longevity of the fence.

T. Sousa questioned how the fence will be installed; in addition, will the applicant provide one type of finish or another; the Board requested a sample of both types of finish for the proposed fence.

N. Koury requested more detailed information regarding the long-term maintenance for cleaning of the fencing; will it be power-washed. How frequently does the fence have to be painted / cleaned?

T. Sousa commented that the applicant is recommended to provide more information related to the 'fade rate' of the colors on the fence; what procedures will be taken to replace any fading colors on the fence?

L. Pizzano made a motion to continue the public hearing until August 20, 2018 at 7:00 pm. A. Medeiros seconded the motion. All members were in favor of the motion; motion carried 5-0-0.

3. Site Plan Review – 170 Bradford Street – Applicant - Reginald Santos

Present in Interest – Reginald Santos, Owner and Applicant
Roy Tiano, P.E, Engineering Alliance, Inc.

R. Santos introduced the project by explaining that the proposal includes interior renovation of the existing two-family dwelling and construct a 25' x 49' three-story addition so the end result will be a six-unit multifamily condominium. R. Santos explained the Zoning Board of Appeals granted a variance for the number of units in August 2017. R. Santos explained that part of the proposal includes installing an on-site underground drainage system that will control peak rate Stormwater runoff for the twelve (12) paved surfaces / parking spaces. There will be an enclosed dumpster on the property for resident use.

R. Tiano introduced himself and then explained the project in more detail. He went on to explain that at the direction of the City staff, he will adjust the parking layout to provide 90-degree parking in contrast to the previously proposed 60-degree angled-parking. The dumpster will be enclosed and maintained by a private company.

Anthony Medeiros questioned the distance between the edge of the building and the property line.

N. Koury questioned the dimension of the parking travel aisle. R. Tiano responded that it will be 24-feet wide.

L. Pizzano commented that he does not support the open staircase at the rear of the new building. The applicant responded they will enclose the rear staircase for future plans. The conversation continued regarding the material of the fence; the Board would like to review a sample of the fence. The applicant will remove all snow over 6" snow amounts. L. Pizzano questioned the location of the gas and electric meters to understand the placement of the meters in the future. He went on to comment that the building façade is quite bland and does not

support the proposal. He recommended some additional architectural features of the proposed building; i.e – brick, accent / relief, window shutters, or any other features.

Anthony Medeiros questioned the property will have proper lighting for all areas of the parking and walkways.

M. Vivaldi read the Fire Department comments, dated July 19, 2018 and Police Department comments dated, July 18, 2018.

N. Koury supports the recommendations of L. Pizzano for additional architectural features of the building, she would like an illustration / narrative in the next submittal of the Site Plan. The applicant's engineer will provide a detail of the proposed wall-pack lighting for the property. A landscape plan with planting schedule will be provided, too.

There was discussion of the Board members regarding some sort of measure to protect the side of the building from vehicles from moving into the building.

Anthony Medeiros question the applicant of the location of the exhaust pipes for kitchen and stove exhaust / laundry exhaust? The developer will attempt to exhaust as many pipes as possible to the roof, but will ensure that any that are on the side will be camouflaged as possible.

N. Koury questioned the location of the HVAC units, the applicant responded that they will be placed on the right-hand side of the building as viewed from the Bradford Street. The Board requests details of the hand-rails.

T. Sousa commented the architectural elevations are not consistent, one plan shows an porch entry on one side and another plan show a different view. He is adamant that the plans are not ambiguous with different sets showing different information.

Resident, Jean Iandolo, 164 Bradford Street, commented that the property is too dense for the neighborhood. It is not fair.

Resident, Mary LaRay, 138 Bradford Street, commented that her opposition is related to the density and the height of the proposed building. The proposed building is not 'Neighborhood Friendly'. She questioned the distance of the HVAC to the property line, R. Tiano responded that it is currently 7-feet. The resident questioned if the applicant has considered any visitor parking for the property, the applicant responded the parking will not be designated spaces. She believes the applicant should scale down the building.

Resident, Peter LaRay, 138 Bradford Street, commented the proposal is too dense for the neighborhood. The Dwelling district permits 1 and 2 family structures, but now the proposal includes a six (6) multi-family structure.

Councilor, M. McLaughlin commented that the ZBA has already permitted the variance to exceed the Dwelling district for 1 and 2 family buildings, as the proposal stands tonight, he is opposed to the building.

L. Pizzano made a motion to continue the public hearing for 170 Bradford Street to September 10, 2018 at 7:00 pm; F. Cafasso seconded the motion. All members were in favor of the motion to continue the public hearing.

4. Zoning Amendment – City of Everett – Inclusionary Zoning – Section 32

F. Cafasso made a motion to continue the public meeting. T. Sousa introduced the new recommendation to the Board to reduce the percentages in the following manner and areas:

The percentage of affordable units may be reduced for one or more properties located in the Lower Broadway EDD, Commercial Triangle EDD, and Riverfront Overlay District in the following manner –

- *District Reduction Incentive of 5%: if the property is located in the Lower Broadway EDD, Commercial Triangle EDD and/or Riverfront Overlay District.*
- *Remediation Reduction of 5%: if the property is located within the districts listed above and the site is a designated M.G.L Chapter 21E site, federal brownfield site, or has a recorded Activity Use Limitation (AUL). Further environmental remediation must be required for the proposed project to be completed.*

The remediation reduction does not apply to projects with less than 13 units.

Buyback provision for properties located in the LBEDD, CTEDD, and Riverfront Overlay District:

- *5% of units at a cost of TBD per unit applies only for developments with 50 units or more.*

Sunset provision: All of the changes above shall expire after 5 years of passage.

T. Sousa explained the major of blighted contaminated parcels are located in these three (3) areas. T. Sousa explained the City is required by the State to provide 10% affordable housing stock throughout the City. In terms of the remediation areas, the City should incentivize the redevelopment of these property sites. Through this recommendation, if developers are interested to utilize the buyback' provision, then those developers may utilize an additional 5% reduction of affordable housing. With the Sunset provision, the City can revisit the Ordinance and its details at the end of 5-years.

J. Soper elaborated that these are good ideas to redevelop these properties within Everett. It would be beneficial to have some sort of residential amenities for residents, too.

There was discussion of whether developers could achieve any further decrease of affordability, it was recommended that 5% would be the lowest requirement.

The City will need to refine and its recommendation under the 'Buyback' provision, either through the City Council or through the Planning Board.

L. Pizzano recommends to change the Sunset Provision from 5-years to 3-years; 10% affordability across the board and no concessions. Additionally, he recommends that the trigger point from 6 new units to 4 units.

N. Koury supports the recommendations for the reduction of affordability in the areas where the properties need remediation; the 21E sites create a 'big' challenge to developers. There are approximately 25 contaminated sites '21E sites' throughout the City, though often

F. Cafasso supports the recommendation to provide flexibility for developers to achieve some 'relief' to clean up contaminated properties.

There was discussion of the level of contamination; does '21-E' have defined level of contamination, is it a Tiered contamination.

J. Silverstein reminded the Board that the Inclusionary Zoning is a discretionary Special Permit that may provide flexibility to the Board when the applicant is presenting the development proposal. F. Cafasso supports the discretionary ability of the Special Permit.

L. Pizzano recommends the staff prepare a 'draft' of this evening's discussion prior to the next scheduled meeting, August 20, 2018.

L. Pizzano made a motion to continue the hearing for zoning amendment for Inclusionary Zoning to August 20, 2018 at 7:00 pm; A. Medeiros seconded the motion. All members were in favor of the motion to continue the public hearing.

III. New Business -

• **Request Site Plan Endorsement for 302 Broadway – Eric Kenworthy**

F. Cafasso made a motion to endorse the Site Plan; M. O'Connoor seconded the motion, all members were in favor; the Board endorsed the Site Plan for 302 Broadway.

IV. Old Business –

V. Approval of Meeting Minutes -

L. Pizzano made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of June 25, 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. Adjourn -

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 9:50 pm

Approved by Planning Board: August 20, 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 AUG 21 P 3:50