



MAYOR
JON MITCHELL
PLANNING DIRECTOR
JENNIFER CARLONI

City of New Bedford Department of City Planning

133 William Street • Room 303 • New Bedford, Massachusetts 02740
Telephone: (508) 979.1488 • Facsimile: (508) 979.1576

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK
NEW BEDFORD, MA

2022 MAR 10 PM 2:59

CITY CLERK

PLANNING BOARD

NEW BEDFORD PLANNING BOARD REMOTE MEETING March 10, 2021

MEETING MINUTES

PRESENT: Kathryn Duff, *Chairperson*
Arthur Glassman, *Vice-Chairperson*
Alex Kalife
Peter Cruz
Kamile Khazan
Shayne Trimbell

ABSENT: None

STAFF: Michael McCarthy
Anne Louro

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Duff called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and provided a statement related to Covid-19 and public meetings.

2. CALL OF THE ROLL

Chairperson Duff called the roll.

A motion was made (AG) and seconded (PC) to open the public hearing.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Board Member Glassman – Yes	Board Member Kalife – Yes
Board Member Khazan – Yes	Board Member Cruz - Yes
Chairperson Duff – Yes	

Motion passes 5-0

3. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

OLD BUSINESS:

ITEM 1 – CASE #21-03/#21-04 — Request by applicant for a Special Permit for a Marijuana Establishment for the operation of Marijuana Retailer, and a Special Permit for parking relief and site plan review for proposed improvements to the site and exterior and interior renovations to the building at 115 Coggeshall Street (Map: 86 Lot: 10) a 9,499 SF site in an Industrial B (IB) zoned district and the Hicks-Logan-Sawyer Interim Planning Overlay District (HLS IPOD). Owner: Met Real Estate LLC (10 Bryn Mawr Road, Wellesley, MA 02482). Applicant: Southcoast Apothecary, LLC (PO Box 62727, Newton Lower Falls, MA 02462).

Continued from the February 10, 2021 meeting.

Chairperson Duff noted receipt of the CDM Smith Peer Review of the traffic study. She stated the requests contained therein were forwarded to the applicant. Chairperson Duff noted the applicant has not yet had time to respond, and as such she called for a continuance to the March 17, 2021 meeting.

A motion was made (AG) and seconded (PC) to continue the matter.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Board Member Glassman – Yes

Board Member Kalife – Yes

Board Member Khazan – Yes

Board Member Cruz - Yes

Chairperson Duff – Yes

Motion passes 5-0

NEW BUSINESS:

ITEM 1 –

CASE #21-05 - Request by City Councilor Joseph P. Lopes for the Planning Board to review and make a recommendation to the City Council for its consideration of amending the City of New Bedford Zoning By-Laws, Chapter 9, Section 2110, replacing Wamsutta Mill Overlay District and WEDROD District with a Waterfront Mixed Use Districted and amending the Working Waterfront Overlay District and Hicks-Logan-Sawyer IPOD.

CASE #21-06 - Request by City Councilor Joseph P. Lopes for the Planning Board to review and make a recommendation to the City Council for its consideration of amending the City of New Bedford Zoning By-Laws, Chapter 9, to create an Advanced Manufacturing Campus and allow for the redevelopment of approximately 100 acres at the site of the Whaling City Golf Course property on Hathaway Road.

Chairperson Duff noted this case has been before the board previously and the board had made an October recommendation which had to be rectified. It appears again this evening for another formal recommendation.

Emily Keyes Innes provided a history of her work on the project. She acknowledged her work with the planning staff. She explained the waterfront zoning, the focus areas and sub-areas, the targeted goals, as well as the public infrastructure improvements addressed with the proposed zoning recommendation.

Ms. Innes then addressed the Advanced Manufacturing Campus section of the city. She explained the goal of the proposed zoning as relates to the Master Plan. She discussed permitting and uses, development standards, streetscape, guidelines, et cetera. She spoke on sustainable development. She invited questions.

Chairperson Duff read into the record correspondence received 3/10/21 from SRTA, requesting a language amendment, et cetera.

In response to Chairperson Duff, Ms. Innes stated she has no issue with establishing designated bus stops appropriately, considering private infrastructure intersecting public infrastructure. There was further discussion on the matter, including the language.

Chairperson Duff consulted with the SRTA representative present, who explained their access goals.

In response to Chairperson Duff's invitation to speak or be recorded in favor or opposition regarding the question of the zoning bylaw recommendations, Jeff Pontiff commented on the process, having sat on the land use committees. He stated he finds the ordinance a serious development in the changing of the waterfront zoning. He feels this important conversation would be best had after the pandemic in a public meeting with stakeholders. Chairperson Duff, while acknowledging the technical challenges, noted the length of time and opportunity to review this matter.

Mr. Pontiff spoke on Subsection C, additional uses and pedestrian access on the state pier.

Ms. Innes spoke on the state pier issue and project history/process.

In response to Chairperson Duff's invitation to speak or be recorded in favor or opposition, Khalid Bilal, accompanied by his mother Jacqueline Hall Smith, expressed their agreement with Mr. Pontiff. He felt that stakeholder comments would be helpful, and that the suggested retail usage could conflict with state pier.

Ms. Innes addressed potential conflicts as relates to the proposed zoning changing. Chairperson Duff noted that future projects would come before the planning board for approval.

In response to Chairperson Duff's invitation to speak or be recorded in favor or opposition, Att. John Whiteside, representing East Coast Seafood, located in Sub-area B, as well as other companies, all in opposition. He stated public access to shipyards and seafood processing plants, parking lots, loading zones represent dangers. He felt this was an added layer of unnecessary regulatory restrictions in the lifeblood of the city. He stated his client received no notice, as was the case with many other companies. He too felt this matter should be continued to accommodate comments from other stakeholders.

At Chairperson Duff's request, Ms. Innes recapped the opportunities to weigh in on the matter. Ms. Innes expressed agreement with Att. Whiteside in regard to restricted public access to industrial areas. She distinguished between the zoning and the redevelopment plans, and spoke on public access and regulations. She further discussed the issues as relates to the sub areas. She then addressed comments on the process the

matter will continue to undergo. In response to Chairperson Duff's inquiry as to public meetings held, Ms. Innes listed the same.

Chairperson Duff clarified the uses included in Focus Sub area B in Focus Area North.

In response to Chairperson Duff's invitation to speak or be recorded in favor or opposition, Att. Whiteside inquired as to consideration of land owners' deeds within sub-area. He expressed further concern with zoning amendments related to public access.

Ms. Innes addressed and clarified the deed issue/public access issue as raised.

In response to Chairperson Duff's invitation to speak or be recorded in favor or opposition, Anisha Savino inquired as to environmental impacts to the area, including increased traffic, parking, infrastructure, et cetera. There was board and applicant discussion on the topics, including impacts resulting from the proposed changes, as well as the redevelopment plans, noting no traffic study to date. Chairperson Duff had discussion regarding Chapter 91.

In response to Chairperson Duff's invitation to speak or be recorded in favor or opposition, Michael Livingston, stated he represented Eastern Fisheries, et al, including seafood workers, captains and crews. He raised Chapter 91 protections and leases terms related to public access.

Ms. Innes noted her role is as an urban planner and could not answer lease specific questions versus Chapter 91, but spoke on uses.

Assistant Solicitor Elizabeth Liden also spoke on the Chapter 91 regulations, noting the crafting of the proposed zoning.

In response to Chairperson Duff's invitation to speak or be recorded in favor or opposition, Andy Anello, 123 Sawyer Street provided comments to the board, some concerning meeting notice. The noticing process related to zoning changes was reviewed by Anne Louro.

In response to Chairperson Duff's invitation to speak or be recorded in favor or opposition, Paulo DaSilva, 40 Washburn Street, inquired as to F&B Tire plans, relating an incident. Chairperson Duff commented briefly, noting the matter is not before the board.

In response to Chairperson Duff's invitation to speak or be recorded in favor or opposition, Kamile Khazan inquired as to what the AMC Project entails, such as uses, wetland protection, et cetera.

Chairperson Duff, after clarifying there are no proposed campus approvals this evening, invited Ms. Innes to speak on the issue raised, which she did, qualifying her focus on the zoning rather than the RFP, but explaining the associated process. Chairperson Duff stated on the record that the development of the RFP process is a great opportunity to engage the public in the development process.

Jeff Pontiff commented on Chapter 91 licenses. He felt that for the city to move forward they need a process for modified Chapter 91 licenses.

In response to Chairperson Duff's invitation to speak or be recorded in favor or opposition, an abutting stakeholder from Advanced Marine Technologies reiterated Att. Whiteside's comments, addressed notice, and spoke on his own work on the redevelopment plan. He noted his opposition to the establishment of Sub-Area D.

There was discussion with Ms. Innes related to proposed changes, and clarification of the abutter's concerns.

Assistant Solicitor Liden spoke on the concerns, further explaining Designated Port Area restrictions/process.

In response to Chairperson Duff's invitation to speak or be recorded in favor or opposition, a Shoreline Resources representative expressed agreement with Mr. Pontiff's request to continue the matter and get more information for stakeholders, especially on public access/use.

There was discussion on the issue and regulations of the uses, noting public access on the waterfront is still governed by the Chapter 91 license. She also referred to the New Bedford/Fairhaven Municipal Harbor Plan.

Chairperson Duff noted the concerns and comments from the waterfront businesses. She also noted that her understanding is that the intent of the proposed changes are not to impede those businesses or their potential expansion, and suggested more education on the proposed changes. She inquired again as to stakeholder meetings.

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

Board Member Glassman noted his receipt of waterfront business phone calls on their concerns, which has raised his own concerns.

Assistant Solicitor Liden felt the concerns related to public access under chapter 91. She noted the plan has gone through an extensive public process and was previously noticed. There was discussion on further opportunity for public input.

Chairperson Duff noted her appearance at meetings and changes in the plan. She felt the zoning proposal was before this board to reflect the redevelopment plans, which went through an extensive public process.

Board Member Khazan expressed agreement with Board Member Glassman's thoughts about another meeting to give business owners another opportunity to discuss it publicly. Chairperson Duff noted the board could make a recommendation that that happen. She commented on what appeared to be a lack of familiarity with the proposed changes by business owners.

Board Member Cruz agreed with Chairperson Duff to make a recommendation to have an abutters meeting.

There was then board discussion on the Advanced Manufacturing Campus proposal, which Board Member Glassman expressed support of.

There was discussion on any recommendation or condition contents.

Anne Louro expressed a concern about the board's ability to condition the act of the city council.

Assistant Solicitor Liden noted the plan has already been approved by city council. Ms. Innes stated the council had yet to meet on the plans themselves.

After requesting permission Chris O'Neal, Dartmouth Planning Board Member, inquired as to whether there were any residential multi-units being considered on the area for use of AMC employers. He also inquired as to any traffic studies done prior to proposed zoning changes.

Chairperson Duff noted the public comment phase had completed and the board was now in discussion. She also noted that traffic studies would occur when the RFP goes out, but that the board is not reviewing any uses/proposed buildings.

Board discussion on the recommendations continued.

A motion was then made (AG) and seconded (PC) regarding Case #21-05 to recommend the proposed ordinance amendment amending City of New Bedford Zoning By-Laws, Chapter 9, Section 2110, District Section 4600, Wamsutta Mill Overlay District Section 47A and WEDROD District and amending the Working Waterfront Overlay District Section 4661B, and Hicks-Logan-Sawyer IPOD Section 4100A and Waterfront Mixed Use Districted to include a new Waterfront Mixed Use Districted. The proposal would create four zones and subareas along the waterfront with associated mixed use development and design guidelines to promote and support economic revitalization or retaining existing industry and water dependent uses. The district includes Sub-area A bound by Interstate 195 to the north, Belleville Ave and North Front Street to the east, Wamsutta Street and Kilburn Street to the south, and Rte. 18 to the west. Sub-area B is bound by Kilburn Street and Interstate 195 to the north, the New Bedford Harbor to the east, the Wamsutta Street outflow to the south, and North Front Street and Belleville Ave to the west. Sub Area C bound by MacArthur Drive to the south and east, and JFK Memorial Highway to north and west. Sub-area D bound by MacArthur Drive and Leonard's Wharf to the north, New Bedford Harbor to the east, McKennon Street Power plant to the south, and Mccather Drive to the west. The establishment of the WMU is intended to maintain the historic character of the district and enhance public access into and within the waterfront. In addition, the proposed zoning would consolidate overlay zoning by removing cautions of the Hicks-Logan-Sawyer interim planning overlay district south of 195, the Waterfront Economic Development & Revitalization Overlay District and the Wamsutta Mills Overlay District. The WMU zoning is intended to replace a portion of the aforementioned overlay districts. The new WMU district includes proposed changes to allow land uses in each subarea. Incentives to support new development in each subarea while encouraging public enhancements and proposes development standards and design guidelines to control the integration of new development within the existing built environment within the existing areas. Along with this, is to recommend the focus areas of north and south areas, meeting with plan consultant and encourage access to designated bus stops. We encourage meeting with Focus Area North and South stakeholders along with planning and the consultant prior to city council acting.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Board Member Glassman – Yes

Board Member Kalife – Yes

Board Member Khazan – Yes

Board Member Cruz - Yes

Chairperson Duff – Yes
Motion passes 5-0

A motion was made (AG) and seconded (PC) to approve Case #21-06, ordinance amendment for the Advanced Manufacturing Campus. Motion to recommend the proposed ordinance amendment amending City of New Bedford Zoning By-Laws, Chapter 9, Section 2110, District to insert a section titled "Advanced Manufacturing Campus" after Mill Overlay District. The proposed Advanced Manufacturing Campus would create a new Masterplan Mixed Use District suitable for the use related to life sciences and advanced manufacturing. The boundaries of the AMC are boundaries for Parcel B 99.86 acres on the plan titled "Subdivision Plan" prepared for Mass development, dated 10/7/20 and on file with the city clerk. The MAC will supersede all other zoning district regulations in this area, except the flood hazard overlay. In the case of any potential discrepancy between AMC and the FHOD, the FHOS regulations shall apply. The detailed Masterplan shall be prepared and submitted to the planning board for the approval of the entirety of the proposed development and/or redevelopment with the AMC Overlay District.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Board Member Glassman – Yes	Board Member Kalife – Yes
Board Member Khazan – Yes	Board Member Cruz - Yes
Chairperson Duff – Yes	
Motion passes 5-0	

ITEM 2: CASE #21-07 - Request by City Councilor Joseph P. Lopes for the Planning Board to review and make a recommendation to the City Council for its consideration regarding the rezoning the following locations from Industrial B to Mixed-Use Business: West Side Morton Court Street (Map: 21 Lots: 42, 1, 2, and 4); West Side South Front Street (Map: 25 Lots: 122, 113, 150, 72, 131, 71 and 70); 371-383R South Front Street (Map: 31 Lot: 197); 13 Rivet Street (Map: 31 Lot: 142); 1 Rivet Street (Map: 31 Lot: 143); 56 Potomska Street (Map: 31 Lot: 239); 756 South Water Street (Map: 31 Lot: 232); 65 Potomska Street (Map: 31 Lot: 245); West Side MacArthur Drive (Map: 31 Lots: 256, 250 and 257); 49 Potomska Street (Map: 31 Lot: 242); and 39 South Street (Map: 37 Lots: 293 and 312), and the following locations from Warehouse I/Industrial B to Mixed-Use Business: 75 MacArthur Drive (Map: 31 Lot: 248) and West Side MacArthur Drive (Map: 31 Lot: 255).

Chairperson Duff informed the board, while in the process of being withdrawn, needs to be continued to the 4/14/21 meeting for internal processing regulations.

A motion was made (AG) and seconded (PC) to continue the matter.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Board Member Glassman – Yes	Board Member Kalife – Yes
Board Member Khazan – Yes	Board Member Cruz - Yes
Chairperson Duff – Yes	
Motion passes 5-0	

ITEM 3: CASE #21-08 - Request by applicant for Site Plan Review for the expansion of the existing parking lot associated with the multifamily residential building to provide an additional 52 parking spaces at 55

Wamsutta Street (Map: 78 Lot: 125), a 1.3-acre site in an Industrial B zoned district in the Wamsutta Mill Overlay District. Owner/Applicant: Wamsutta II, LLC c/o Acorn, Inc. (25 Braintree Hill Office Park, Suite 104, Braintree, MA 02184).

Nicole Dunphy, High Point Engineering, provided a presentation for the board. She provided a history, to include converting the mill building into 33 residential apartments. She spoke about the parking space requirements, the desired parking ratio, and possible expansion of the parking lot. She noted the location of a retaining wall and some landscaping. She stated the details of the proposal, such as concrete curbing, addition of gravel due to pets, plantings, et cetera. She commented on the proposed installation of deep sump pump catch basins and runoff. She then detailed the planned process. She spoke on previous work done, such as site lighting, which they plan to maintain. Ms. Dunphy detailed other improvements and proposed plans, including striping, landscaping, drainage, handicap spaces, et cetera. She invited questions.

Chairperson Duff suggested more shade trees. There was some discussion on the topic and description of the property, as well as the planned gravel/pea stone area.

Applicant's representative spoke on landscaping issues, noting 75 Wamsutta was developed under an approved site plan. He noted that 55 Wamsutta also had an approved site plan. He stated the additional parking was recently purchased and is being added as a resident convenience. He noted there are additional plantings not shown, and he discussed the same. Ms. Dunphy added the positions of snow storage areas and had further discussion on potential tree planting areas. In response to inquiry by Chairperson Duff, there was further discussion on snow storage areas.

In response to Chairperson Duff related to 3/8/21 DPI comments, Ms. Dunphy stated she had no issues and reviewed the comments. Chairperson Duff reminded the applicant of the notice of intent requirement by the Conservation Commission. Ms. Dunphy noted she was unaware of that, the project being outside the buffer zone and the flood plain. There was further discussion on the matter.

There was some board discussion on issues resolved since the reports.

Chairperson Duff revisited the topic of planting areas with Ms. Dunphy and had further discussion and explanation on the same.

Board Member Cruz, stating he had no comments, requested Ms. Dunphy go through the drainage plans for the public. Ms. Dunphy provided the same, discussing watershed areas, system runoff capacity, et cetera.

There was no response to Chairperson Duff's invitation to speak or be recorded in favor or opposition.

After discussion by the board, a motion was made (AG) and seconded (PC) to approve site plan review for the expansion of the existing parking lot associated with the multifamily residential building to provide an additional 52 parking spaces at 55 Wamsutta Street (Map: 78 Lot: 125), a 1.3-acre site in an Industrial B zoned district in the Wamsutta Mill Overlay District, with the following general conditions:

- The project shall be completed according to the plans, notes, reports and specifications submitted for the consideration and final approval by the Planning Board;

- The applicant shall file an NOI with the Conservation Commission prior to the issuance of a building permit;
- The project shall be undertaken in a manner consistent with any departmental memos received in relation to plan and placed on file for planning board consideration. The conditions of such memos shall be considered to be part of these conditions;
- Applicant shall submit final plan revisions to the Department of City Planning in the following formats: one 11x17 plan set, one CD or USB plan set in a PDF format, and shall ensure that these same plans are properly submitted to the Department of Inspectional Services;
- The applicant shall ensure that a copy of the Notice of Decision bearing the certification of the New Bedford City Clerk signifying no appeal has been brought against the project approval be provided for the Department of City Planning case file folder;
- The applicant shall ensure that a copy of the Notice of Decision bearing the certification of the New Bedford City Clerk signifying no appeal has been brought against the project approval be recorded at the Registry of Deeds;
- The applicant shall ensure that a copy of the recorded decision be provided for the Department of City Planning case file folder;
- That the applicant shall present any proposed modification from the approved plans for consideration to the director of city planning for determination as to whether the modified plan requires further review by the planning board;
- That the rights authorized by the granted approval must be exercised by issuance of a building permit by the Department of Inspectional Services and acted upon within one year from the date granted or they will lapse.
- The developer and site contractor must schedule a preconstruction meeting with the Department of Public Infrastructure prior to the start of construction.

In addition to the following specific conditions:

- Subject to DPI comments from 3/8/21;
- Applicant to meet with Conservation agent; and if modified, plans must come back for further review by the board;
- Two trees shall be planted along the south stone landscaped area on the property's south side.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Board Member Glassman – Yes	Board Member Kalife – Yes
Board Member Khazan – Yes	Board Member Cruz - Yes
Chairperson Duff – Yes	
Motion passes 5-0	

Chairperson Duff recused herself from hearing Cases #21-09/#21-10. She announced Board Member Shayne Trimbell would carry forward on the matter and excused herself from the meeting.

ITEM 4: CASES #21-09/#21-10 - Request by applicant for Site Plan Review for the conversion of three-story parsonage building to a 15-unit apartment building and construction of a 15-space parking lot on the north side of the building, and a Special Permit for the reduction of parking/loading space and landscape buffer requirements at 563 County Street (Map: 58 Lot: 259), a 13,187-square foot site in a Residence A zoned

district. Owner: St. Lawrence Church Corp. (PO Box 2577, Fall River, MA 02820). Applicant: Charing Cross Realty Trust (2 Centennial Drive, Peabody, MA 01960).

Bill Luster explained the project location, as well as a property history and project plans. He explained the partnership with the New Bedford Development Corporation, the development arm of the New Bedford Housing Authority. He described the proposed units, the associated funding, and the location details. He introduced the team on the call. Mr. Luster acknowledged they had read both the staff report and the DPI memo, and they embrace each condition.

John Marchand, Farland Corp., displayed and explained photos, plans, and parking areas. He described their existing conditions plan, noting the pedestrian access areas. Mr. Marchand described the site, including concrete walkways and parking lot. Mr. Marchand then discussed the proposed 15 space parking lot on the building's north side, including the handicapped access. He discussed landscape buffering and their special permit request.

Mr. Marchand described the parking space size, parking aisle width, zoning board relief sought, lighting, landscaping. He then discussed storm water and drainage. He invited questions.

David Andrade described the building itself and displayed renderings. He noted this was a historic renovation and the limits/requirements that attach to that. He explained the units, noting that they are not designed as family units, but more likely for singles.

Mr. Luster discussed the boarded windows described in the staff report, noting that the windows had been unboarded and may require replacement.

Board Member Glassman expressed his confidence with the site plan as regards the building, noting its historic review, but he noted concern about the parking lot, such as the available spaces and lack of snow storage areas, et cetera. Board Member Glassman offered suggestions, such as a nearby parking lot.

Board Member Cruz shared his concerns about the available parking area, including addition of a dumpster and the AC condensers location. Applicant's representative spoke to the AC condensers location and the historic challenges, as well as the roll out dumpster location. Board Member Cruz made further inquiry, such as any enclosure of the AC units. The applicant's representatives discussed the concerns, including availability of the nearby parking lot, space dimensions, pedestrian traffic/access, stairs on the rectory building, walkways, et cetera.

Board Member Khazan discussed consideration of a motion to continue the matter to another date in order to afford the public an opportunity to speak.

Board Member Trimbell inquired as to bike parking, the applicant pointed out the location of the same.

Board Member Cruz and Board Member Glassman raised the issue of snow removal/storage.

Anne Louro implored the board to go forward with the meeting process in order to hear the waiting public, noting that cable access will continue recording.

A motion was made (PC) and seconded (AK) to open the public hearing.

Board Member Glassman read into the record a letter from abutter Maria G. Fernandes expressing her concerns and her late receipt of the meeting notice.

Board Member Glassman read into the record a letter from the New Bedford Development Corporation in support of the project.

In response to Board Member Glassman's invitation to speak or be recorded in favor or opposition, Khalid Bilal, 107 Summer St., stated the project would be a neighborhood disaster. He spoke on the parking, the curb cut, and the improper steps taken on the project.

Michael McCarthy addressed the notice concerns raised.

In response to Board Member Glassman's invitation to speak or be recorded in favor or opposition, Pamela DosSantos, 115 Summer St., confirmed the same experience with letters of notice. She noted an overnight letter she sent and was received, but was not read into the record. Ms. DosSantos read her letter of opposition into the record.

There was public discussion on the number of vehicles per unit and space around schools.

In response to Board Member Glassman's invitation to speak or be recorded in favor or opposition, a male discussed his feeling that this matter needs to be continued for others, who may have left due to the 9:00 p.m. ending, to have the opportunity to speak.

In response to Board Member Glassman's invitation to speak or be recorded in favor or opposition, Patricia Dixon, owner 111 Summer St., requested the meeting be extended. She noted her agreement with comments related to the difficulty with parking and the proposed curb cut.

Board Member Glassman elected to leave the public hearing open for future comments.

After board discussion, a motion (PC) was made and seconded (AK) to continue the matter to April 14, 2021. No opposition to the motion was voiced.

Mr. Bilal added opposition on the record for Ms. Hall Smith.

Anne Louro commented on the notice issues raised.

4. ADJOURNMENT:

A motion was made (PC) and seconded (KK) to adjourn at 9:23 p.m.

Whereupon proceedings concluded.



Alexander J. Kalife, Clerk

5/12/2021

Date