



Planning Board

February 10, 2016 – 6:00 PM – **Minutes**

New Bedford Free Main Public Library, 613 Pleasant Street

PRESENT: **Colleen Dawicki, Chairperson**
 Kathryn Duff
 Peter Cruz
 Arthur Glassman
 Alexander Kalife

ABSENT: No members absent

STAFF: **Jennifer Clarke, AICP, Acting City Planner**
 Constance Brawders, Staff Planner

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Dawicki called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

ROLL CALL

A formal roll call was conducted confirming members present as stated above.

MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL

A motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to approve the February 10, 2016 meeting minutes. Motion passed unopposed.

A motion was made (AG) and seconded (PC) to take the agenda out of order. Motion passed unopposed.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Item #4

CASE #8-16 - Request by City Councilor Joseph Lopes for recommendation by the Planning Board for the rezoning of 458 Dartmouth Street (Map 18, Lot 106) from Industrial B to the Mixed Use Business (MUB) zoning district.

David Arruda of Dartmouth MA, real estate broker for the property owner, stated that the zoning change request is a result of the limited uses the property is zoned. He stated that while Industrial B allows for many uses, the surrounding properties have more comparable uses allowed in Mixed Use Business. He stated the property has been on the market more than a year and any potential buyers do not want to go through the processing needed to meet their planned use. Uses such as offices, small restaurant, even a bank, as was a previous use of the building, are not allowed under the present zoning.

In response to Ms. Dawicki, Mr. Arruda stated uses under Mixed Use would include a bank, which one buyer

The matters listed are those reasonably anticipated by the Chair to be discussed at the meeting.

Not all items listed may, in fact, be discussed. Other items not listed may be brought up for discussion to the extent permitted by law.

Massachusetts General Laws, chapter 30A, Section 20(e) requires any person making a video or audio recording of the meeting to notify the Chair at the start of the meeting.

was interested in, but felt the process too cumbersome to pursue. He added he envisions office uses for an attorney, real estate brokerage, accountants, or a small restaurant. He stated he did not expect Industrial Use would ever return to that area.

In response to Mr. Glassman, Ms. Clarke noted Housing Authority Property directly across the street zoned Residential C. The block containing the subject property is all Industrial B. She noted that the city envisioned Mixed Use Business for the area, and is in line with the Master Plan.

A motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to open the public hearing. Motion passed unopposed.

In response to Ms. Dawicki's invitation to speak or be recorded in favor of the proposal, Richard Brisson, owner of the subject property, stated he purchased the vacant property which had been a bank, and converted it into a pharmacy. He stated in 2014 he was the last independent pharmacist in the city.

In response to Ms. Dawicki's invitation to speak or be recorded in favor of the proposal, Councilor Joseph Lopes stated the area is no longer used as industrial manufacturing. He asked the board to allow change the zoning clarification in accordance with the Master Plan proposals.

There was no response to Ms. Dawicki's further invitation to speak or be recorded in favor.
There was no response to Ms. Dawicki's invitation to speak or be recorded in opposition.

A motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to close the public hearing. Motion passed unopposed.

Ms. Clarke shared that the City Solicitor's Office had provided a formal opinion in response to Ms. Clarke's request and confirmed that while this was spot zoning, case law provides consideration of the public good. She felt this may be the kind of spot zoning warranting consideration for change due to Master Plan objectives.

Mr. Glassman agreed.

Ms. Clarke stated the board would have to determine if it is spot zoning, and then, if desiring to vote in favor, the board should articulate its reasoning so as not to send the wrong message going forward.

Ms. Dawicki noted that planning staff comments contained evaluation points for the board to consider, and she shared several. She noted spot zoning concerns verses economic development impacts. She also noted that no negative neighborhood impact comments had been presented for the board's consideration. She also noted surrounding commercial businesses.

Ms. Clarke noted that Industrial use sites require a minimum of five (5) acres and precludes many uses.

Ms. Duff stated that non-conforming uses in the Industrial B can include retail, such as Stop & Shop.

Ms. Dawicki encouraged Councilor Lopes to pursue the entire block has being presented for rezoning, and noted the Master Plan suggests what should be done here. She noted this is a recommendation to City Council. She noted the benefits she would like to see incorporated into the recommendation.

A motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to approve the request by City Councilor Joseph Lopes for the rezoning of the parcel located at 458 Dartmouth Street from Industrial B to Mixed Use Business (MUB) and recommend the same to the city council.

Motion passed 5-0.

The matters listed are those reasonably anticipated by the Chair to be discussed at the meeting.

Not all items listed may, in fact, be discussed. Other items not listed may be brought up for discussion to the extent permitted by law.

Massachusetts General Laws, chapter 30A, Section 20(e) requires any person making a video or audio recording of the meeting to notify the Chair at the start of the meeting.

Item #1

Case 05-16: Proposed amendments of Chapter 9 of the Code of Ordinances relative to body art establishments to strike existing Section 4212 and insert a new Section 4212 Zoning Board Authority, to amend that Section by adding a new Section 4212.3 pertaining to the clarification of conditions imposed by the Zoning Board of Appeals, to amend that Section by adding a new Section 4212.4 pertaining to appeals of enforcement and to strike existing Section 4252 and insert a new Section 4252 providing for screening.

It was noted that the proposed amendment had been available for review in the Planning Office

Councilor Lopes stated that he made a motion to change the current ordinance to allow for a screening area to be enclosed by “traditional screening” rather than blacking out windows. He stated screening will prevent pedestrians from viewing a patron getting body art on a sensitive or private body area. He noted the initial motion was passed by the City Council.

In response to Mr. Glassman, Councilor Lopes stated there were presently four such businesses within the city.

A motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to open the public hearing. Motion passed unopposed.

There was no response to Ms. Dawicki’s invitation to speak in favor.

In response to Ms. Dawicki’s invitation to be recorded in favor was Venessa Kollars, 67 Orleans Street, New Bedford.

There was no response to Ms. Dawicki’s invitation to speak or be recorded in opposition.

A motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to close the public hearing. Motion passed unopposed.

Ms. Duff felt it in the interest of public safety issue to not have blacked out windows, but agreed the screening was necessary.

After brief discussion, the board concurred the application fee should be concurrent with cost of legal advertising and administrative expenses.

A motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to recommend adoption of the proposed amendment to Chapter 9 of the Code of Ordinances relative to body art establishments as articulated in Case # 05-16 with the amendment that the fees be concurrent with the fees at the time and subject to review by staff.

Motion passed 5-0.

Item #2

Case 06-16: Request by applicant for Site Plan approval for a 29,500+/- SF expansion of an existing 47,200+/- SF industrial seafood processing plant located at 43 Blackmer Street (Map 25A, Lot 1, 3 & 52), in the Industrial B and Working Waterfront Overlay zoning districts. Applicant’s agent: Cavanaro Consulting, 687 Main Street, Norwell, MA 02061.

John Cavanaro stated the North Coast Seafood, sited on a former brown field, had previously come before the board. The applicant worked, together with the city, to develop the property. He stated this 6.5 acre site has a 47,000 SF building. He stated that before the board is a proposal for a 29,500 SF building addition. He stated the proposed 28-29% lot coverage is below the minimum 50% required. He stated they are below height

The matters listed are those reasonably anticipated by the Chair to be discussed at the meeting.

Not all items listed may, in fact, be discussed. Other items not listed may be brought up for discussion to the extent permitted by law.

Massachusetts General Laws, chapter 30A, Section 20(e) requires any person making a video or audio recording of the meeting to notify the Chair at the start of the meeting.

restrictions and within green space requirements. He stated the facility requires 52 parking spaces, and they will have 90 spaces, with four handicap van accessible spaces. He stated they are planning on eight loading bays at the Blackmer Street facility. He noted the site is surrounded by a floodplain area, which comes slightly into the perimeter of the site. He stated a Notice of Intent has been filed.

Mr. Cavanaro stated the addition to the west side of the property will include additional parking and the movement of the nitrogen tank further west. He stated acquisition of the new parcel will let them use one way tractor trailer traffic. He stated exit alignment and storm water management had been discussed with DPI. He explained those features and noted all runoff will be kept on-site property. Mr. Cavanaro reviewed the landscaping plans, then introduced Brian Jones of Rivermoor Engineering.

Mr. Jones noted that Rivermoor was the engineer for the original project for this property. He stated they are matching the look of the existing building, and explained how elevations and the exterior areas will blend with original design. He noted the new building will use a white membrane roof. The facility plans were reviewed.

In response to Ms. Duff, Mr. Jones noted the location of the loading bays. He explained to Ms. Duff that the elevations had been revised. Ms. Duff noted the exposed (outdoor) bike rack.

Ms. Dawicki invited the applicant to go through the staff comments.

Mr. Cavanaro stated the DPI comments were as expected, referring to reconstruction of sidewalks, storm water management standards and calculations. He stated they had no present comments from the Conservation Commission. Mr. Cavanaro noted as a coastal floodplain they have no performance standard and the project will not be a detriment to the resource area. He noted the square footage measurements needed corrections. He stated they could provide any specifics on landscaping and lighting. He noted there are wall packs, stanchion lights and streetlights on the roadway. He stated their plan is for minimal lighting that can still provide safety, and stated they would provide a photo metrics plan, if needed.

Mr. Cavanaro noted that waivers had been requested, noting no 21E Plan had been done. He noted this was the expansion of an existing facility.

In response to Mr. Cruz regarding ADA compliant curb cuts, Mr. Cavanaro stated they would adhere to DPI standards. Mr. Cavanaro explained curb cuts to be closed. Mr. Cavanaro noted the location of accessible parking and the nearby entrance.

Mr. Cruz questioned why South Front Street and Blackmer Street had no radiuses tying back into the existing roadway. Mr. Cavanaro stated that city engineering required 90° cuts. Mr. Cruz inquired as to whether a tractor trailer could pull onto South Front Street safely. Mr. Cavanaro reiterated the engineering requirements they were asked to lay out.

In response to Ms. Dawicki, Mr. Cavanaro illustrated the location of snow storage areas. Bruce Fontes, General Manager, stated there had been no snow storage problems in the past as they have contracted a snow removal company, which on occasion has cleared Blackmer Street.

Mr. Jones showed the dumpster locations on the site plan.

Ms. Duff asked if the applicant would consider street trees flanking the South Water Street entrance. The applicant agreed to consider the request. Ms. Duff confirmed the remaining grass area that will be kept. Ms. Dawicki referred Ms. Duff to DPI comments.

Ms. Dawicki noted the planning staff comments had requested the applicant provide a lighting plan.

The matters listed are those reasonably anticipated by the Chair to be discussed at the meeting.

Not all items listed may, in fact, be discussed. Other items not listed may be brought up for discussion to the extent permitted by law.

Massachusetts General Laws, chapter 30A, Section 20(e) requires any person making a video or audio recording of the meeting to notify the Chair at the start of the meeting.

Mr. Cruz asked the applicant to describe the drainage at the loading area, which the applicant did. Mr. Cruz inquired as to the applicant's willingness to use granite curbing at the site entrance. The applicant agreed to consider the suggestion.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Cruz regarding signage, Mr. Fontes stated the only signage presently is on the nitrogen tank and did not believe any more were proposed.

A motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to open the public hearing. Motion passed unopposed.

There was no response to Ms. Dawicki's invitation to speak or be recorded in favor.

In response to Ms. Dawicki's invitation to speak in opposition, Melissa Christy of 208 Rodney French Boulevard, New Bedford, stated she was speaking on behalf of a Portuguese-speaking tenant who has concerns with regard to the extent and direction of the building to be done. She stated the NWD building at 89 Blackmer Street, now closed down, had trailer traffic at all hours of the night, as well as freezer trailers running all night, which disturbed the neighbors.

In response to Ms. Dawicki, Ms. Christie clarified the noise problems were associated with the NWD operation.

There was no response to Ms. Dawicki's further invitation to speak or be recorded in opposition.

In rebuttal, Mr. Cavanaro stated the NWD building will be demolished and the proposed project pushes the building further east, away from adjacent residences. Mr. Fontes stated that the entire new addition and associated traffic will come through Blackmer Street, as it currently does, at the 24hour/7 day facility. He stated there is a single 2:00 a.m. trailer that is loaded at the shipping bay. Any box truck blast freezers proposed would be on the north and not the west side of the building.

A motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to close the public hearing. Motion passed unopposed.

Ms. Duff inquired as to any regulation governing hours of operation in an Industrial zone. Ms. Clarke stated she would have to research the answer.

Ms. Dawicki reviewed the applicant's request for waivers, and requests contained in staff comments, such as the lighting and landscape plans, construction notes, and the use of straw bales for erosion control.

After further board discussion on conditions, a motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to grant the waivers requested by the applicant proposing a 29,500 (+/-) SF expansion to an existing business located at 43 Blackmer Street, with the exception of the comments by the staff that would negate the waiver request. Motion passed 5-0.

A motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to approve site plan review for the proposed 29,500 (+/-) SF expansion of the existing industrial building located at 43 Blackmer Street with the following conditions: that the applicant accommodate the recommendations of DPI; that the applicant accommodate any recommendations from the Conservation Commission once their review is completed; that the applicant accommodate the staff comments and recommendations; and that the applicant update the application to reflect the updated plans and elevations; and that the applicant agree to continue the granite curbing at the street access area into the property to match existing granite curb both on South Front and Blackmer Streets.

The matters listed are those reasonably anticipated by the Chair to be discussed at the meeting.

Not all items listed may, in fact, be discussed. Other items not listed may be brought up for discussion to the extent permitted by law.

Massachusetts General Laws, chapter 30A, Section 20(e) requires any person making a video or audio recording of the meeting to notify the Chair at the start of the meeting.

Motion passed 5-0.

ITEM #3

Case 07-16: Request by applicant for Site Plan approval for a 4,547+/- SF commercial parking lot located at the east side of Acushnet Avenue (Map 93, Lot 68), in the Mixed Use Business (MUB) zoning district. Applicant's agent: Comprehensive Design-Build Services, P.O. Box 578 West Wareham, MA 02575.

Armando Pereira from Comprehensive Design-Build Services explained that the site had a three-story building upon it that suffered a fire and was acquired by Kevin Welch in 2011. He stated the 4,728 (+/-) SF site has a two foot soil strip in the rear being used for drainage. In October 2015 Mr. Welch applied for a permit to create a parking lot, which was rejected (by the Department of Inspectional Services). Pereira stated the property can hold eight parking spots, one of which would be a compact vehicle spot due to an adjacent building projecting onto the Welch property. He stated another area for an available space would encroach on an egress door.

Mr. Pereira stated they will do planting and a gravel bed in the lower back area which has been discussed with DPI. The city's Acushnet Avenue development removed some street parking, and a parking lot on a presently vacant lot makes sense. He noted a "right of passage" existing on the lot, but stated he was unable to locate the width. He stated it does specify that it should allow people travel between Lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 between Coggeshall Street, this lot, and onto Acushnet Avenue. Mr. Pereira stated their plan allows for continuance of this passage.

Att. Mike Medeiros, 286 Union Street, New Bedford, noted the delineation of the "right of passage". He stated a title examination back to 1892 showed the first mention of the "right of passage" is in a deed conveyed in 1987. He illustrated the locations of the various lots.

A motion was made (PC) and seconded (KD) to accept the plan. Motion passed unopposed.

Att. Medeiros explained he believed these to be common lots with various buildings upon them. He stated the owner at the time subdivided the lots and granted a "right of passage". Att. Medeiros stated there are no specific metes, bounds, or delineation on any plan or deed. He stated that leaves only the natural flow. He explained the curb cut where the "right of passage" meets Acushnet Avenue and the opening lies in back, shows the natural flow of passage in that instance.

Mr. Pereira noted waivers requested for site lighting, which he evaluated with his drone. He noted Mr. Welch's concerns about activity on the site. Mr. Pereira noted the location of the lights on Mr. Welch's building and the absence of splashing on the south building, but it did illustrate people passing through the site, which contains hidden areas of concern.

In response to Ms. Dawicki, Kevin Welch, 1128 Acushnet Avenue, stated the parking spots will be for the building next-door. In response to Mr. Dawicki, Mr. Welch stated there is present signage saying No Parking.

In response to Ms. Duff, Mr. Pereira stated there was no intent at this time to provide screening, which would increase areas for people to hide. Ms. Duff disagreed.

Mr. Cruz inquired as to whether the applicant intends to develop and record metes and bounds to remedy future confusion.

Att. Medeiros stated he believed it would require a concerted effort from all the lot owners to agree and sign on

The matters listed are those reasonably anticipated by the Chair to be discussed at the meeting.

Not all items listed may, in fact, be discussed. Other items not listed may be brought up for discussion to the extent permitted by law.

Massachusetts General Laws, chapter 30A, Section 20(e) requires any person making a video or audio recording of the meeting to notify the Chair at the start of the meeting.

to the specific delineation as the exact location of the area. Att. Medeiros noted the plans submitted depict the location of the structures in relation to the lot lines and one is left to navigate between the structures as to where the easement area to pass and repass is located.

Mr. Cruz expressed concern that the compact car spaces intrudes onto the “right of passage” as assumed. Mr. Pereira reiterated the protrusion of an adjacent building onto Mr. Welch’s property in relation to the compact parking space. Mr. Cruz clarified that his problem was the intrusion of the space onto the “right of passage” for all five lots.

Att. Medeiros stated this is a convenient width for vehicular traversing. In response to Ms. Duff, Att. Medeiros read the language, which did not specify whether the right to pass was by foot or by vehicle. Att. Medeiros stated the usage over time indicates it includes vehicles.

Att. Medeiros stated that the owner of Lot 2 has gone before ZBA to have an addition. Though he did not expand the footprint, he did cantilever over the “right of passage” area. In essence, this has limited the height of a vehicle that can travel the “right of passage”, which could be argued as a prejudice to owners of Lots, 1, 3, 4 and 5. Apparently relief was granted on a zoning variance.

Mr. Cruz discussed drainage and the gravel bed, Mr. Pereira stated it should be 12”. He stated it is in existence and noted that snow would be moved to this back area of the lot. He noted the lot slopes to the back away from Acushnet Avenue.

Ms. Dawicki invited any comment from the representative of the city’s Building Department. Joseph Kauffman, building inspector, stated the building department is following the process, give everyone due diligence to absolve the city of any liabilities. He stated he felt the parking plan was probably the best for that area. He acknowledged this as a high risk area. He stated he believed the court process determined the passage to be carriages with regard to the “right of passage”, which would translate into vehicles. He noted the cantilevering affects the height to limit the passage to cars. He stated the rear drainage plan is good, but not large enough in his opinion. He disagrees with the sloping statement and suggests a French drain.

A motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to open the public hearing. Motion passed unopposed.

In response to Ms. Dawicki’s invitation to speak in favor, Christopher Sheldon, 8 Harmony Street, New Bedford, stated he was the owner of Southern Light Solar located at 1130 Acushnet Avenue, adjacent to the subject lot. He stated he has been at the location since 2012 and the lot at that time was used for parking. He stated 2012 renovations resulted in the city installing the existing curb cut. He stated this parking lot is important to his business and his twenty employees, as there are only eight spaces on Acushnet Avenue. He noted there have been two stabbings, a shooting and a murder within a block of his office, and this lot provides important lighting and security for his business. He noted the three restaurants in the area.

In response to Mr. Glassman, Mr. Sheldon stated the spaces were for everyone in the building.

In response to Ms. Dawicki’s further invitation to speak in favor, Kevin Welch stated he was in favor of the parking lot for the reason just pointed out by Mr. Sheldon.

In response to Ms. Dawicki’s further invitation to speak in favor, Ricardo Santos, 1118 Acushnet Avenue, presented a drawing to the board.

A motion was made (PC) and seconded (KD) to accept the drawing. Motion passed unopposed.

The matters listed are those reasonably anticipated by the Chair to be discussed at the meeting.

Not all items listed may, in fact, be discussed. Other items not listed may be brought up for discussion to the extent permitted by law.

Massachusetts General Laws, chapter 30A, Section 20(e) requires any person making a video or audio recording of the meeting to notify the Chair at the start of the meeting.

Mr. Santos stated he owns the building just south of the subject property and is an architect. He expressed happiness that this is being handled in the proper way, as this will address and improve this area. He explained the drawing he provided. He stated the third sheet of staff comment mentions abutters, but he and his property were completely missed. He stated zoning regulation to separate residential and commercial uses, such as the rear of his building, were not at all addressed in the plan presented.

Mr. Santos read his notes addressing the numbers depicted on the drawing he provided and he cited ordinances for the same. #1 lighting, which he claims comes through his 2nd floor windows; #2 screening and landscaping. He stated his rear parking was approved by special permit and locks in the vehicular easement. He also noted availability of emergency access, which was resolved in court; #3 snow storage should be identified in the applicant's final parking plan; #4 improper chain-link fence blocking the easement and entry to his house; #5 He stated his drawing depicts the only location for the vehicular easement, which should be painted on the asphalt. #6 He is looking for actual dimensions to be sure his building will no longer be hit by cars. #7 States the Acushnet Avenue side of the property should be improved by landscape. Mr. Santos stated his plan contains nine city compliant parking spots, including a handicap spot closer to Mr. Welch's building entry. He offered his drawn plan for use by the applicant.

Mr. Santos felt his approach was more compliant. He stated he expects some landscaping between the parking lot and his residential use per city ordinance. He stated his plan allows him to get into his house more safely. He stated he looks forward to working with Mr. Welch and the city and offered some help in paying for landscaping.

Ms. Duff clarified the location of Mr. Santos' residential exit. She inquired of the address for his residential unit. Mr. Santos stated it was 1118 Acushnet Avenue, but the rear is his residential entry.

There was no response to Ms. Dawicki's further invitation to speak or be heard in opposition.

Ms. Dawicki suspended the public hearing.

By way of rebuttal, Mr. Pereira stated the light splash will be addressed. He stated city of New Bedford ordinances require ten by twenty spaces and those presented are eighteen feet, and likewise will be addressed. Mr. Pereira stated the area of Mr. Santos' exit has no easement, and is on Mr. Welch's property and will have to be worked out. He stated landscaping must be looked at in light of present area activities.

Att. Medeiros stated Mr. Santos' plan is self-serving. He stated Mr. Santos owns the structure but not the land in the area he seeks to protect. He stated Mr. Santos has three entrances to his building. Att. Medeiros then noted the location of the cantilever installed by Mr. Santos. He stated that the granting of Mr. Santos' parking spot does negate the "right of passage".

Mr. Pereira stated they would install curb stops as required. Mr. Pereira stated there is an existing portion of fencing that still leaves an opening for the "right of passage", but he clarified there is no right of vehicle storage. He noted the "right of passage" cannot be used now by an ambulance.

In response to Ms. Dawicki, Mr. Welch indicated there are no parking signs present, but stated he would put a sign up.

Ms. Dawicki noted the buffer zone is not part of the board's purview and could be appropriately directed by a condition in the motion.

The matters listed are those reasonably anticipated by the Chair to be discussed at the meeting.

Not all items listed may, in fact, be discussed. Other items not listed may be brought up for discussion to the extent permitted by law.

Massachusetts General Laws, chapter 30A, Section 20(e) requires any person making a video or audio recording of the meeting to notify the Chair at the start of the meeting.

A motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to close the public hearing. . Motion passed unopposed.

In response to Ms. Duff's question about any liability to the board regarding their delineating a path, Ms. Clarke stated that is a legal issue she would defer to a legal review.

The board discussed landscaping, drainage, curb stops, protective barriers, lighting, repaving and repair, and needed plan corrections.

A motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to approve site plan review for a 4,547(+/-) SF commercial parking lot located at the east side of Acushnet Avenue, in the Mixed Use Business (MUB) zoning district with the following conditions: that the applicant provide legal documentation of the said designated "right of passage" and the scaling and location of the "right of passage" on the plan; that the applicant/engineer provide documentation for a calculation of the propose drainage trench along the eastern edge of the proposed parking area; that the applicant's engineer provide a solution to be approved by the planning staff for some sort of barrier or protective buffer zone between cars and the existing building on the southern edge of the parking area; that the applicant make all of the changes as noted by the planning staff comments; that the applicant accommodate the planning staff comments in particular the comment relative to the paving and repairs to the asphalt area; that the applicant add the small triangulated landscape area along Acushnet Avenue between the proposed parking areas and the sidewalk, and that the planning staff approve said landscaped area; and that the applicant make proper signage of the accessible parking spots being proposed on the eastern edge of the parking area.

Motion passed 5-0.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

ITEM #5- (Case Continuance from 01/13/2016 and 02/10/2016)

Case 01-16: Greater New Bedford Community Health Center HIIP Project - Request by applicant for a Special Permit for reduction of parking spaces, and Case 02-16: Greater New Bedford Community Health Center HIIP Project - Request by applicant for Site Plan approval for the expansion of an existing medical clinic, located at 838-842 Purchase Street (Map 53, Lots 30, 30A, 30B & 30C), in the Mixed Use Business zoning district. Applicant: Daniel P. Faber, Dan's Restoration Company, Inc., 49 Doolittle Avenue, Dartmouth, MA 02747.

Att. Michael Kehoe, on behalf of the applicant, informed the board of project changes; namely, the removal of the third floor. This present two-story project will have a 4.500 (+/-) SF reduction and changes to the roof line. He noted the previous plan was four feet above the roof of an abutter. The revised plan will be approximately eight feet below the abutter's roof line.

Att. Kehoe, met with the abutter's attorney and the abutters feel their concerns have been addressed with the revised plan. Att. Kehoe, requested that the board condition that the applicant's roof line will be six feet or more below the abutter's roof line. Att. Kehoe, stated he wished to be on record as noting his client has agreed to remove a tree in the alley way.

Kevin Caldwell, 488 Pleasant Street, New Bedford, stated the applicant felt it appropriate, in light of abutter concerns, to go with the two-story scheme in this location. He stated the revised plan still meets their federal grant requirements. He noted this evening's site plan is identical to that previously seen by the board but for the roof. He noted the front elevation change to the streetscape will only be some 3.5".

Mr. Caldwell reviewed the floor plan and roof drainage, noting they will install a white rubber roof. He noted the elevator hoist will sit some 3-4" up and some 25' back from the street, essentially unseen from the street.

The matters listed are those reasonably anticipated by the Chair to be discussed at the meeting.

Not all items listed may, in fact, be discussed. Other items not listed may be brought up for discussion to the extent permitted by law.

Massachusetts General Laws, chapter 30A, Section 20(e) requires any person making a video or audio recording of the meeting to notify the Chair at the start of the meeting.

He then provided a streetscape of the existing buildings on the campus block.

Ms. Dawicki, noting concerns expressed at the previous hearing, stated the traffic commission had confirmed a total of 32 spaces invoiced monthly, long-term leases not being available. She questioned the expected staffing levels.

Dan Bertoldo, 21 Susan Street, New Bedford, Chairman of the Board of Directors, stated there are presently 270 employees, many being part-time. He then stated that averaged to 191 full-time equivalents. He estimated an additional eight full-time equivalent staff.

Ms. Dawicki stated quick calculation with the reduction of square footage results in a need for 23 fewer spaces. The full facility requiring 86, leaving relief of 44 spaces. She questioned the potential leasing of any additional garage spaces. Mr. Kehoe stated once the new project is complete, it is planned to meet the previous ratio, adding 8-10 additional spaces. Mr. Kehoe noted that the 32 spaces presently leased are not all used on a daily basis. He noted they have an additional 10 spaces in a rear parking lot.

A motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to open the public hearing. Motion passed unopposed.

In response to Ms. Dawicki's invitation to speak in favor, Benjamin of 836 Purchase Street, an abutter, stated he had no objection about parking spaces, as it is downtown in a city. He stated their concern was roof drains.

In response to Ms. Dawicki's further invitation to speak in favor, Dan Bertoldo expressed the benefit of the Health Center and those it serves in the city, noting this proposal will increase service to some 2,000 people.

In response to Ms. Dawicki's further invitation to speak in favor, Eleanor Lewis, 27 Center Street, New Bedford, Vice Chairman of the Health Center Board thanked the board for their consideration. She stated that some 26,000 New Bedford residents use the center, and they look forward to expanding services.

There was no response to Ms. Dawicki's further invitation to speak or be recorded in favor.

There was no response to Ms. Dawicki's invitation to speak or be recorded in opposition.

A motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to close the public hearing. Motion passed unopposed.

After brief discussion by the board, along with Ms. Clarke, a motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to approve a Special Permit for parking relief for the Greater New Bedford Community Health Center Project located at 838-842 Purchase Street for relief of 44 parking spaces relative to their proposed plan, subject to the condition that the applicant review with the zoning officer the securing of additional spaces in the Elm Street Garage once the project is completed.

Motion passed 5-0

After brief discussion by the board, a motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to approve a Site Plan Review for the Greater New Bedford Community Health Center Project, an expansion of their existing building located at 838-842 Purchase Street, with the condition that the newly revised proposed addition be at least six feet below the abutting property to the south of the proposed expansion.

Motion passed 5-0.

NEW BUSINESS:

Ms. Clarke the informed the board of the complete street policy. She provided the draft of the policy to the board. She stated this incorporates roadway design and purpose. Future street construction will take these

The matters listed are those reasonably anticipated by the Chair to be discussed at the meeting.

Not all items listed may, in fact, be discussed. Other items not listed may be brought up for discussion to the extent permitted by law.

Massachusetts General Laws, chapter 30A, Section 20(e) requires any person making a video or audio recording of the meeting to notify the Chair at the start of the meeting.

factors into consideration. She mentioned the availability of additional funding opened for roadwork by such a policy. She also provided a proposed resolution for the council.

Ms. Clarke Town of Freetown sent notice regarding approvals issued.

A FEMA Notice of Intent is available in the Planning Department.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the board, a motion was made (AG) and seconded (PC) to adjourn. Motion passed unopposed.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 pm.

NEXT MEETING
Wednesday, April 6, 2016