

WATERTOWN PLANNING BOARD

DATE: November 10, 2014 PLACE: Town Council Chamber TIME: 7:00 PM COMMENCED: 7:05 PM

PURPOSE OF MEETING: Regular Monthly Meeting

PRESENT: John Hawes, Chairman; Jeff Brown; Fergal Brennock; Linda Tuttle-Barletta; Neal Corbett
Steve Magoon, Director; Ingrid Marchesano, Clerk to the Planning Board; Gideon Schreiber, Senior Planner; Andrea Adams, Senior Planner

ADMINISTRATION BUSINESS

Jeff Brown motioned to approve Minutes of 10/8/14.

Linda Tuttle-Barletta seconded the motion.

VOTE: 4-0 In favor

CASE PENDING:

- **65 Grove Street;** Edward Nardi, Cresset Grove LLC – **Special Permit with Site Plan Review**

John Hawes, 65 Grove Street will not be heard tonight.

Linda Tuttle-Barletta motioned to continue the above petition until the next meeting of Planning Board.

Fergal Brennock seconded the motion.

VOTE: 4-0 In favor

PROPOSED ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT

- **PLEASANT STREET CORRIDOR DISTRICT**

John Hawes, the pending Text Amendment for the Pleasant Street Corridor District will not be discussed tonight. The hearing will be continued to the Planning Board's meeting in November.

Linda Tuttle-Barletta motioned to continue the hearing on the proposed Pleasant Street Corridor Text Amendment to the Board's meeting in November.

Jeff Brown seconded the motion.

Vote: 4-0 In Favor.

7:10 Neal Corbett arrived at this time

CASE PENDING

- **28 Fayette Street;** Junming Gao - **Special Permit**

Fe Bon Chang, contractor, this is a petition for a partial reconstruction of a two-family structure. The Petitioner hired him to demolish part of the existing building because the foundation is not structurally sound. The proposal also involves adding square footage to the building.

Andrea Adams, the property is located in a T zone on a 5,213 s.f. lot Special Permit is requested to raze and rebuild portion of the existing structure and replace it with a 2-story unit, the farmer's porch will remain. A new driveway along the same side will be constructed. Special Permit criteria have been met, the allowed FAR is 0.50, and the proposed is 0.59. The driveway will be 8.45 feet wide. Staff recommends an approval with conditions.

John Hawes, the proposed driveway coming in from Fayette Street is quite steep. Will a retaining wall be built?

Fe Bon Chang, a short retaining wall of about 4 feet would be built to accommodate the proposed new driveway.

Linda Tuttle-Barletta motioned to recommend to the Zoning Board of Appeals approval of a Special Permit under Section 5.04 based on the finding that the project meets the criteria set forth in the Zoning Ordinance and subject to the conditions set forth in the Staff Report.

Jeff Brown seconded the motion.

Vote: 5-0 In Favor.

CONTINUED CASE

- **631, 651-653, 655 Mt. Auburn Street & 268 Arlington Street; Robert Korff Coolidge Square II LLC - Special Permit with Site Plan Review**

William York, Atty, on behalf of Coolidge Square LLC, the principal property owner, Mr. Korff, had started with a "by right" project. The team presenting tonight consists of Robert Korff and Dean Holt (Principal Owners), William Gobel (Bohler Engineering), Kevin Patten (BKA Architects), Robert Michaud (MDM Associates/Traffic Engineer), Marty Breen (CVS). The site is now non-conforming in multiple respects, and will be substantially brought into conformance with zoning. There had been a number of meetings with Town Departments. The third party review of the Petitioner's Traffic Analysis was done. The project had gone before Site Plan Review and had held the required Community Meeting in the East End of Watertown. Slides indicating how the site had changed from the existing conditions were shown. The property owners had met with Town Planning staff with an initial design to preserve the existing 12,000 square foot building on the site. This configuration would have included a surface parking lot where the old gasoline station is now. This plan would also have had an entrance drive into the site from Mount Auburn Street. This design was presented to the Planning Staff and the Town Department of Public Works and was allowed by right. One of the issues with this plan was the entrance drive off Mount Auburn Street, and with the building facing onto the interior parking lot. This plan did not create good urban and pedestrian design. The Town staff suggested that the property owners seek to acquire the Elks property, directly behind the old gas station. Mr. Korff did acquire the Elks property, but is aware of the way this parcel would assist with good land use planning. This revised plan shows a 13,000 square foot CVS with a 1,300 square foot mezzanine area. The new design, which is before the Planning Board for consideration, re-oriented the proposed CVS to face Mount Auburn Street, and through the acquisition of the defunct gas station, allows the store's façade to wrap around to Arlington Street. The current plan also allows the consolidation of the site drives, and allows the creation of a new access/egress drive along Arlington Street, the ability to bring the site into full compliance with the Zoning Ordinance, and to add much needed landscaping to the site. Open space was increased on site to 19.0% and the stormwater management on site would be upgraded. The Petitioner had meetings with the Town DPW and held a Community Meeting. These meetings allowed the Petitioner to incorporate several suggested changes into the site design. The retention of the second curb-cut by the upper corner at Wells Avenue, and to create an egress for the TILL property. The final site design and plan includes a significant amount of new landscaping. The second access on Wells Avenue would be a one-way entrance leading to the municipal lot and the connection to the TILL property. The design meets all of the suggestions raised at the Community Meeting. The Petitioner has acquired additional parcels at great expense to make the project zoning compliant.

Bill Gobel, PE, Bohler Engineering, the current site is 100% impervious. There is no green space or significant stormwater management on site. There are various curb cuts and driveways. The Petitioner intends to upgrade the municipal parking lot. The entrance off Arlington Street had a right-turn only restriction. Low Impact Design drainage feature is proposed on the site. The site has 40 parking spaces for the CVS use. The municipal lot will continue to have 47 parking spaces. The area between TILL and the public parking lot would be better defined. The trash enclosure/loading area had been moved as far from the Wells Avenue area as the development

team could get it. The trucks servicing the site would be WB-40's. An additional green space has been added to the site along Arlington Street, and between the CVS and the TILL property. The intent was to provide a better traffic circulation around the parking lot. Shade trees will be planted and protected. The understory landscaping along Wells Avenue should help buffer Wells Avenue from the proposed development. The proposed storm water management systems had been discussed with the Town's Department of Public Works, and the peak rates of runoff would be reduced between 50%-100%. The quality of the runoff would also be improved by LID design and stormceptor devices. The lights would be directed only onto the CVS property. The Petitioner would also be adjusting the lighting in the public parking area.

Kevin Patten, Architect, BKA Architects, the floor plans are showing the location of the Mount Auburn Grill, the waste management and receiving areas. The in store mezzanine which would be for storage would be accessed by stairs and a reciprocating vertical conveyor. The pharmacy would be located in the store. The entrance is at an angle to the intersection of the Mt. Auburn and Arlington streets, and the signage will be illuminated with gooseneck fixtures. The primary material will be brick, accented by a lighter colored stone. The rendering showed shelving behind but not immediately blocking the large windows. The sill of the windows will be relatively low; about 36 inches. The design of the CVS is similar to the existing retail shops along the block, the treatment is similar to adjacent buildings. A cap and cornice line above the store front height is proposed. Elevations of the other sides of the building are shown. The main roof height is about 18 feet, which is similar to the adjacent Mt. Auburn Grill. There is a bump-up on the rear to give the building the height needed to accommodate the interior mezzanine space. A rendering of all of Mt. Auburn Grill is showing the rhythm of the façade, and the relative heights of the windows in both buildings. A close-up view of the corner entrance and the side along Mount Auburn Street was shown. The cast stone base, brickwork and masonry coursing, and a cap are shown, as well as the recessed sections of the intervening pilasters. The corners of the entrance had been rounded off, and the storefront had been framed heavily, to create a passage through the wall from the street to the store. Incised panels are placed below the windows.

Robert Michaud, Principal, MDM Transportation, the Traffic Study had been expanded to look at additional road links and intersections. Total of 7 locations were studied. The added incremental trips will be drawn from the Arlington Street and Mount Auburn Street corridors. The increases were modest, the Traffic Study had been peer reviewed by the Town's consultants. There will be a diversion of trips away from a left turn on Arlington Street, and exit instead out the parcel side closest to Wells Avenue. The pharmacy use trips were compared versus the existing uses. The difference in the existing and new trips net out to between 5 to 51 new trips depending on the time of day (AM, Midday). This data was peer reviewed. There is no anticipated change in Level of Service at the signals at Mount Auburn Street. Generally, the intersections have the capacity to handle the anticipated new trips expected from the project. The Petitioner's is proposing transportation mitigation, these mitigation commitments had been discussed with the Town DPW.

William York, the Town has asked the Petitioner to provide a future easement at the corner of Mount Auburn and Arlington Streets.

Robert Michaud, the improvements are the outcome of the Mount Auburn Corridor Study. Re-striping of lanes would allow for an additional lane. A 4-6 widening would be needed at the corner and going up Arlington Street. The Petitioner had agreed to an easement along this edge of the property to facilitate the Town right of way and road widening.

Gideon Schreiber, I will only touch on parts of the staff report not already dealt with in the Petitioner's presentation. The Community Meeting was held on August 4, 2014. The Petitioner

had provided a summary of the comments received, and that had been distributed to the Planning Board. The staff report included a summary of public comments received to date, and copies of emails and letters had been distributed to the Board. The .9 acre site is located in LB district that was created in 1988 Growth Management Plan. The 2004 Community Development Plan added sidewalks, landscape, etc. The Strategic Plan of 2011 identified the need for change. The Draft Comprehensive Plan is in progress and speaks to improvement of this area. The proposed development will benefit the Coolidge Square by creating active pedestrian streetscape with parking in the rear. The Design Guidelines spoke to adding residential floor. The 4 guidelines for granting of the Special Permit have been met. Mixture of materials will preserve the historic nature of buildings in the area. The site will be accessible by all means of transportation. The Town consulting firm provided peer review of traffic report. Town Engineer Matt Shuman was satisfied with the result. The store will be open from 7am to 10pm. Deliveries will be provided twice a week during night hours. The existing site does not have any landscaping. Applicant has agreed to potentially allow residential or office second story to be added in the future. Number of parcels was purchased to allow for this project to be build. The circulation component has been met, six bike parking spaces will be installed adjacent to the front door. Utility service is adequate for the site. All HVAC and other utility equipment will be screened. There will not be any light spillage onto adjacent properties. Staff recommends approval with 14 conditions and that all windows along Mt.Auburn Street remain unobstructed.

Jeff Brown, is the store size the same as in Belmont? Is the mezzanine enclosed? What is the truck circulation pattern? The pedestrian corner entrance is unusual. The design is a generic CVS plan; there will be no pedestrian movement at that corner entrance location.

Kevin Patten, the proposed store was about 13,000 square feet. The mezzanine was walled off and can accommodate pallets. Two streets are joined at this corner, the proposed entrance is appropriate. To have a business on the corner, the entrance should be addressed to each street, and to turn the building to just one street seems to do a dis-service. There is relatively little on-street parking, and as such, the entrance is keyed to pedestrian traffic. There is plenty of cross-walk activity from the park and from the adjacent Tufts Health building.

John Hawes, my concern is about the left turn from Arlington, going North, into the site, has it been addressed? I am particularly concerned about the traffic condition during rush hour, with backups occurring on to Grove Street. The intersection will be tightly packed, there is concern about the turning movements at this location. The Town's Ordinance does not get into the economic impact on merchants in Coolidge Square, this might be part of the review criterion about no negative impacts. I am interested in the resident's comments on the potential impacts. CVS would act as a draw for more customers in the area.

Robert Michaud, the updated Traffic Study presents the level of activity that that movement will have.

Neal Corbett, I need a clarification about the status of the existing municipal parking lot. Would the parking meters remain in place? Will the store be a 24-hour operation? The site is relatively close to the Belmont and Cambridge Town lines. Is there a study that indicates the relative spacing of the stores so that the service areas would not overlap? I suggest that the spacing seemed to be about $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile? I commend the Petitioner for assembling the properties and attempting to clean up a somewhat blighted area. At the same time the architectural design is somewhat bland. I question the design for a potential second floor, did the Petitioner plan for this, particularly in terms of parking? Is the potential to increase the height based on the Comprehensive Plan? I question some of the façade treatments, and the grid pattern of the

interior lights. This emphasizes the bulk and scale of the building. I suggest different soffits or different interior lighting schemes to reduce the scale of the building, particularly at night. An awning to break up the façade, particularly on the East or West sides where there is a slight arch, would be preferable. Was any thought given to changing the plane of the building, as it seemed quite straight. The proposed building shown on the renderings could be anywhere. I am looking for a building that is more contextual, with more visual interest.

Attorney York, the 40 parking spaces required for CVS will not be metered spots. The municipal lot along Wells Avenue would remain. The store would operate from 7:00 AM to 10:00 PM. The economic studies show a significant demand for a store in this area serving residents in Watertown. The area is quite dense that more than justifies the store. The CVS on Trapelo Road has not impacted the store in Watertown Square.

Mr. Korff, the closest CVS to the proposed project is the one in Watertown Square. The majority of the business in such a densely populated area would come from about a mile radius. The biggest competition for the proposed store would be the CVS in Watertown Square, but that having another store would take the pressure off the store in the Square.

Attorney York, the request for second story comes from the DCDDP staff. There was no intention at this point for the store to go to a second or third level.

Mr. Korff, my long-term idea for the site was to do something with the whole block, but that would take some time. The proposed project is not subject to the upcoming Design Guidelines, but I am willing to strengthen the building members in anticipation of the possibility of a second floor.

Kevin Patten, there may be a way to drop the soffits or push the ceiling up. The hope is to open the façade to the sidewalk as much as possible. The Mount Auburn façade faces North, so there is no solar benefit to an awning. The door had been placed on the corner, and adding an awning did not seem quite right, so that element was not included in the design. The elements on the West and East are to highlight a bend in the building, where the plane of the sidewalk changed. An architectural element at these locations has been added. Changes in the building plan could be studied further.

Fergal Brennock, is the building a prototype? Will the store have a photo processing service? The pedestrian entrance is good, there is a significant amount of pedestrian traffic, particularly from Tufts. How will the windows on Mount Auburn Street be treated? I have a preference to have a very little covering on the windows on Mount Auburn Street, to maintain the street-scape presence.

Kevin Patten, this configuration is not prototype store layout. There is a photo processing area, but this was largely if not completely non-chemical developing, it is more like a sophisticated color printer.

Gideon Schreiber, the windows will remain transparent. The Petitioner would still be allowed to have up to 20% of the windows covered by signage. A condition could be added to recommend no window signage on the Mount Auburn façade.

George Omartian, 48 Bigelow Avenue, Unit #31, is concerned that the store is smaller than the one that is on Main Street in Watertown Square. That CVS is always out of items. There is a growth of the pharmacy offerings, such as flu shots and a Registered Nurse available to consult

with people. These offerings should be included in the proposed store. The customer age is quite high in East Watertown. There are several blocks of elderly housing in the area. Based on this, the Coolidge Square store should be bigger than what is currently proposed. It is very important to have light from the building come into the street. The white blocks are shown in the background of the windows on Mount Auburn Street in Mr. Patten's renderings

Attorney York, the Watertown Square store was 12,113 square feet in size with a basement mezzanine. The proposed store would be 13,000 square feet with a 1,300 square foot mezzanine. The Belmont store is larger than the one proposed for Coolidge Square.

Kevin Patten, we did not measure all of the windows in the buildings in the area. I will provide another drawing for the ZBA meeting.

George Omartian, what is the width of the sidewalks on Mount Auburn and Arlington Streets? 80 inches should be required, to allow two persons in wheelchairs to pass each other on the sidewalk. I am concerned about snow removal, particularly with respect to keeping the sidewalks clear. The snow removal problem needed to be solved by widening and heating the sidewalk. A canopy over the full frontage would provide a shelter for people in inclement weather. The angled entrance was is good, but it should be set back more to provide better sight-lines. The bus stop should be brought back or moved back to near the CVS versus its current location, which is near the Watertown Diner.

Mr. Gobel, the sidewalk width varies, but it can be up to 15 feet near the intersection. The building line does not vary.

Jeanie Johnston, Mr. Hawes was correct that there is a problem with proposed turning movements in and out of the site at the Arlington Street entrance. I often commute home from Mount Auburn on my bicycle. The proposed traffic pattern at rush hour in the dark is dangerous because the bicyclists will not be able to see the cars coming. The proposed trees need larger planting pits to survive better.

Maria Stenitzky, I have lived in Watertown for at least 50 years, but this intersection is a bottle-neck. How many employees would be in the store and where would they be parking? What will be the delivery times and truck sizes?

Marty Bream, District Manager, a typical CVS would have 8-12 employees. The employees would park in the CVS designated spots. Some employees would also take public transit. CVS gets one to three deliveries from the Brighton warehouse a week. This particular location would be served by a WD-40 truck, which is a 40 foot unit. Private vendors, such as Coca Cola, would do their own direct store delivery. These vendors typically use a smaller truck in urban environments. Servicing from the CVS warehouse would take place between 8:00 PM and 8:00 AM. The deliveries from private vendors would happen during store operating hours. These are the normal delivery hours.

John Hawes, if the traffic engineers can show that the trucks can move in and out of the site properly, the debate of the size of the trucks becomes moot. The amount and hours of delivery are more important.

Attorney York, the Petitioner would abide by the state's noise regulations. The delivery hours could be adjusted.

Malcolm Attaminan, owner of the Mount Auburn Grill, my main concern is the amount of truck traffic and the hours of operation of the proposed store. The private vendors, such as Coca Cola or Pepsi have to unload and stock the shelves, this will cause delivery trucks to queue up in the site. I am concerned that these trucks will be going through our designated parking area, deliveries should be no later than 11:00 AM. Citizen's Bank tows cars after their closing hour, they tow at least three vehicles a week. It cost \$150 to get your car back. The Petitioner owns the lot that Citizen's Bank uses, and that CVS will use. Because of this, the towing should stop. My customer's park in the part of the lot designated for Citizen's Bank. The Bank has signs stating "NO PARKING," and tow cars, even after the Bank is closed.

John Hawes, there will be parking for each use/tenant, and the municipal spots. If people are being towed, then they are illegally parked in the Citizen's Bank spots.

Malcolm Attaminan, I am exasperated that the towing was happening after the Bank had closed for the day, that is not very neighborly. The Petitioner, as property owner, could change the situation.

Attorney York, the Citizen's Bank had lease rights to certain spots. They are controlled by Citizen's Bank and the rest, 23 parking spots, are the Wells Avenue municipal lot.

Angie Kounelis, District A Councilor, CVS will be neighborly to the residents of Coolidge Square, and not have advertising signage in the large windows. CVS in Lexington has a community art gallery in the large windows facing on Main Street. One of the major issues is the traffic impacts. Coolidge Square is getting ever more congested. There was a major traffic accident in which a vehicle collided with and damaged the stone wall enclosing the Old Burying Grounds. This was the same area where a left turn from Arlington Street into the property was being contemplated. Such a turning maneuver should not be allowed. This is a neighborhood area, with Wells Avenue and Bigelow Avenue. There was no parking in the entire area last Friday night because the Greek Church was hosting a bazar and all the restaurants were being heavily patronized. I parked on Wells Avenue and Brighton Towing was towing the first vehicle at the Citizen's Bank parking area. This is the reality in Coolidge Square. All of the traffic reports I've seen have never said that the proposed project will cause a problem. I do not know the solutions. The proposed CVS is lovely, and has many amenities that the neighborhood would want, and for Tufts Health, but it's also too big for this location. Traffic signs had been removed. And I have contacted the Town Traffic Commission, to see if the signs had been approved to be removed, I have never received an answer. However, the removal of these signs would increase the traffic flow in the area. I am concerned with pedestrian traffic, the signals are being activated. I am concerned with the timeframe for CVS deliveries, 8:00 PM to 8:00 AM. This is a residential area, vehicles would be activating their backup alarms and the thumping of the pallets coming off the trucks. Two times a week is still evenings when people won't be able to sleep. There are issues that have not been addressed, and need to be seriously looked at. I have a list of proposed mitigation. There are changes to Mount Auburn and Arlington Street for the convenience of the pedestrians who will be going to CVS from Tufts Health. What will CVS be doing for the neighborhood? These questions need to be answered and addressed before the Planning Board or any other Board makes a recommendation on the project.

John Hawes, did the Councilor receive any feedback from businesses in the Square as to whether the proposed CVS would be a negative, or would attract more business?

Councilor Kounelis, I have not received any feedback from the neighborhood businesses. There needs to be more mitigation at Bigelow, Mount Auburn Street and Wells Avenue. The only mitigation there are the traffic signals. There is no way for a vehicle to easily get out of the Wells Avenue parking lot, merge onto Bigelow and then make its way to Mount Auburn Street and Arlington Street. Mitigation is needed for the neighbors on Wells Avenue. The sidewalks on Wells Avenue are already falling apart on the side of the residential properties. It would be nice for the Petitioner to do more for the neighborhood. The Petitioner purchased the properties for over \$5.0 million dollars, but that should not be on the backs of the tax payers of Watertown.

Joe Levendusky, 13 Templeton Parkway, my front door is about 100 yards from the site. The scale of the development versus what exists in the neighborhood now needs to be addressed. A 14,000+ square foot development is more than 2X the size of retail in the Square now. This is an unprecedented size and scale. CVS will compete with a few of the existing convenience stores. The bigger danger is setting a precedent that will attract competitors and assembly of parcels to bring this scale and larger to Coolidge Square. Not many people who live in the neighborhood give any credence to the traffic study. There are other developments proposed in and around the neighborhood, such as 65 Grove Street. The proposed access from Arlington Street will create an impediment to traffic flow. The project will add traffic that the neighborhood can't handle. The flaw in the traffic study is the assumption that a relatively high percentage of people will walk to the store. The streets around the property are quite narrow. The Board should look comprehensively at all the potential developments in the area. The MBTA is not promising any more transit capacity in the near future. I am concerned about the project's impact on the fabric of the neighborhood and the potential threat to the existing small and medium sized merchants is significant. The CVS will be the first step in the destruction of Coolidge Square. I am urging the Planning Board to deny the project, it is out of scale with the neighborhood.

Elaine Beam, Warren Street, there is a lot of concrete in this area, would the Petitioner consider including a planter in that area? It is disingenuous to say that the Petitioner is constructing a one-story building and may come back and construct a second floor. The project is not appropriate for a residential area.

Attorney York, the Petitioner is working with the Town to construct the sidewalks, and would take direction from the Town as to size of the tree wells. The scale of the project is far less in size than the buildings that it will replace, and CVS, unlike many other businesses in the Square, will provide its own onsite parking.

John Hawes, having the Petitioner strengthen the structure so that it could take a second floor in the future was a feature requested by the Planning Staff. I doubt that the Planning Board would support the required structural stiffening.

Kevin Patten, the building is 18 feet from the sidewalk to the top of the roof, except it is 22 feet tall at the entrance. The measurements of the Mount Auburn Grill are 17 feet from sidewalk to roof. A grade change means that the CVS is taller, but that when the two structures meet up, they are almost identical in height.

Stephanie Orifice, 238 Arlington Street, direct abutter to the intersection of Wells and Arlington. Is there an ordinance that controls the distance between a retailer of this size and public parks? I am concerned about the potential for accidents, cars fly quickly down the streets. The project will bring transient drivers to the area, who won't be aware that Wells Avenue is a one-way. If CVS is approved, we might decide to move. There are few accommodations for the neighbors,

the small businesses and green spaces. The proposed easement on the Arlington Street side will remove some of the green space on that side of the project.

Janet Jameson, Winsor Avenue, Deborah Peterson and I have submitted a survey which should be in the Board's materials. My understanding of the Community Meeting was that there was discussion of the entrance being on Mount Auburn Street, and that it would be pedestrian scaled. This is an entrance to Watertown along Mount Auburn and Arlington Streets. The signage on CVS in Lexington is reduced in scale. The idea from the Community Meeting was to do something different, to include a café, to make things more inviting for the community. Coolidge Square is a village, CVS does not fit into the neighborhood; it's a big box store.

Barbara Ruskin, Spring Street, we need more information. What about solar and LEED standards? What about an island for pedestrian refuges in the roads? Are there any porous pavers in the project? She asked about usable open space? Public art possibilities? This is a chain store; it will hurt local businesses. This CVS has more offerings that affect the businesses in the Square. Strengthening the structure to allow a second floor raises questions about adequate parking, stormwater drainage, etc. Adding office space on the second floor, if it happened, is not mixed use, because mixed use means adding residences. Another issue is allowing such a huge frontage in new buildings. Other communities limit the frontage of new buildings, frontage limitation and transparency zoning has been applied to a CVS in Cambridge. The frontage should be changed and smaller shops allowed. It does not solve the parking problem, but it does solve the street-scape problem and keeps the street lively. Large developers should not take more of the frontage that they should. Don't use Mount Auburn Grill as a model because that is a restaurant, not a model for a retail store.

David Peckar, 24 Wells Avenue, all of the homeowners along Wells Avenue have met several times. The homeowner group had asked me to represent them. This project is very complex. My presentation would take about 20 minutes.

John Hawes, I would like to consider a continuance of the project, things need to be addressed. I did not hear very many positive comments, I am not convinced about the parking or traffic. All of the concerns should be listed, and communicated to the Planning Staff, who will forward them to the Petitioner to be addressed.

Fergal Brennock, Mr. Peckar's concerns should be provided to the Planning Staff, so that the Board and Petitioner could understand them as well.

John Hawes, the Petitioner is present and heard the concerns. There are residences next to a major project, the Board needed to hear those concerns, to ensure that the project was reviewed with all the information in hand.

David Peckar, I have comments on the Staff Report, pg. 7 – *"The use a developed with not adversely affect the neighborhood."* - there is no mention of the residential aspects of the neighborhood in terms of lights from parking lots and cars, noise and activity that faces the neighborhood that are not addressed and that will adversely affect the neighborhood. Item #2 on pg. 11 – Relation of the buildings to the environment - the neighborhood will similarly be affected here. Item #10 on pg. 14 – *"Design/seek to protect abutting properties from detrimental site characteristics."* - there is no mention of the effects to the residential neighborhood. I am concerned about the left turns at the proposed entrance on Arlington Street, the only way of solving this turning movement is through a barrier in the road, all the way up to Grove Street. Most of the homeowners on Wells Avenue would welcome a pharmacy, but the scale and

design is a suburban solution to an urban context. The scale is not appropriate. In terms of the mitigation at Wells Avenue and Bigelow there are solutions, but they involve redesigning the roadway.

John Hawes, credit must be given to the Planning staff for working on the changes to the project. He noted that there were street lights out around the proposed project.

Jeff Brown, the Petitioner should widen the sidewalks to create the needed curb cuts.

Attorney York asked for feedback on the project's architecture. He noted the several meetings the Petitioner had been through. He noted traffic in an urban setting is always difficult. He noted the Town's peer review was critical, and the mitigation proposed by the Petitioner had been supported by this. He praised the Town staff for their feedback on the project. He noted the Peer Review shows that the left turn is not a problem, and also could be looked at a year post-occupancy.

John Hawes, we need clarification from the Police Department in terms of potential problems with the proposed left turn. Board members need to provide comments to the staff so that they can be sent on to the Petitioner. The key issues are the scale, the traffic impacts, and the impact on the existing businesses. A deadline of the end of the week (by November 14th) for Board member and public comments on the project to be sent to the Planning staff.

Councilor Palomba asked for a list of specific concerns about the project from the members of the public.

Linda Tuttle-Barletta motioned to continue the project to the Board's next meeting in December.
Jeff Brown seconded the motion. Vote: 5-0 In Favor.

John Hawes adjourned the meeting at 10:00 PM.

MEETING ADJOURNED: 10:00 PM MINUTES APPROVED: _____
For more detailed Minutes see the DVD dated 11/10/14 which is available in the DCDP office.