



CITY OF SOMERVILLE, MASSACHUSETTS
MAYOR'S OFFICE OF STRATEGIC PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
JOSEPH A. CURTATONE
MAYOR

GEORGE J. PROAKIS
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

PLANNING DIVISION

STAFF

SARAH A. LEWIS, *DIRECTOR OF PLANNING*
DANIEL BARTMAN, *SENIOR PLANNER*
SARAH WHITE, *PLANNER / PRESERVATION PLANNER*
ALEX MELLO, *PLANNER*

MEMBERS

MICHAEL A. CAPUANO, *ESQ., CHAIR*
JOSEPH FAVALORO, *CLERK*
DOROTHY A. KELLY GAY
AMELIA ABOFF
GERARD AMARAL, *ALT*

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

City Council Chambers, 2nd Floor Somerville City Hall, 93 Highland Avenue
Thursday, August 8, 2019
6:00 P.M.
All members present

Previously Opened Cases to Request a Continuance:

<u>20 Prospect Street (PB 2019-06)</u>	
Applicant:	Union Square RELP Master Developer LLC
Property Owner:	The City of Somerville and the Somerville Redevelopment Authority
Agent:	N/A
Legal Notice:	Applicant, Union Square RELP Master Developer LLC and Owners, the City of Somerville and the Somerville Redevelopment Authority, seek Design & Site Plan Review under SZO §5.4 and SZO §6.8 to construct a general building and a Special Permit under SZO §6.8.10.A.4 to authorize a principal entrance for ground floor residential uses oriented toward a side lot line. TOD 100 underlying zoning district. Union Square Overlay District and High-Rise sub district. Ward 2.
Date(s) of Hearing(s):	6/20, 7/11 (re-advertised), 8/8
Staff Recommendation:	Conditional approval
PB Action:	Special Permit was approved on July 11, 2019. Voted on July 11, 2019 to continue the Design and Site Plan Review portion to August 8, 2019.
Case Status:	Voted to continue to August 14, 2019



50 Prospect Street (PB 2019-07)	
Applicant:	Union Square RELP Master Developer LLC
Property Owner:	The City of Somerville and the Somerville Redevelopment Authority
Agent:	N/A
Legal Notice:	Applicant, Union Square RELP Master Developer LLC and Owners, the City of Somerville and the Somerville Redevelopment Authority, seek Design & Site Plan Review under SZO §5.4 and SZO §6.8 to construct a mid-rise podium tower building and a Special Permit under SZO §6.8.10.A.5 to authorize a 5% increase to the dimensions permitted for the point tower of the building. TOD 100 underlying zoning district. Union Square Overlay District and High-Rise sub district. Ward 2.
Date(s) of Hearing(s):	6/20, 7/11 (re-advertised), 8/8
Staff Recommendation:	Conditional approval
PB Action:	Special Permit was approved on July 11, 2019. Voted on July 11, 2019 to continue the Design and Site Plan Review portion to August 8, 2019.
Case Status:	Voted to continue to August 14, 2019

10-50 Prospect Street (PB 2019-05)	
Applicant:	Union Square RELP Master Developer LLC
Property Owner:	The City of Somerville and the Somerville Redevelopment Authority
Agent:	N/A
Legal Notice:	Applicant, Union Square RELP Master Developer LLC and Owners, the City of Somerville and the Somerville Redevelopment Authority, seek Design & Site Plan Review under SZO §5.4 and SZO §6.8 to construct a Plaza civic space type. TOD100 underlying zoning district. Union Square Overlay District and High-Rise sub district. Ward 2.
Date(s) of Hearing(s):	6/20, 7/11 (re-advertised), 8/8
Staff Recommendation:	None at this time.
PB Action:	Voted on July 11, 2019 to continue to August 8, 2019.
Case Status:	Voted to continue to August 14, 2019

346 Somerville Avenue (PB 2019-08)	
Applicant:	346 Somerville Avenue, LLC
Property Owner:	Palmac Realty Corp
Agent:	Richard G. DiGirolamo
Legal Notice:	Applicant, 346 Somerville Avenue, LLC, and Owner, Palmac Realty Corp, seek Special Permits and Special Permit with Site Plan Review (SPSR) to construct a 100-unit residential structure with inclusionary housing. SZO sections and articles including §4.4.1, §8.5, §7.11, Article 9, Article 13. CCD55 zone. Ward 2.
Date(s) of Hearing(s):	3/7, 4/4, 4/18, 5/2, 5/16, 6/6, 6/20, 7/11 (re-advertised), 8/8
Staff Recommendation:	None at this time.
PB Action:	Voted on July 11, 2019 to continue to August 8, 2019.
Current Status:	Voted to continue to August 22, 2019



57 Broadway: (PB 2018-08)	
Applicant:	Centrie Realty, LLC
Property Owner:	Centrie Realty, LLC
Agent:	Richard G. DiGirolamo
Legal Notice:	Applicant and Owner, Centrie Realty, LLC, seek Special Permits to alter a non-conforming property. The existing structure will be demolished and a new building with three residential units and ground floor retail will be constructed. Parking relief. Articles 4, 5, 7, 8, & 9 of the SZO. CCD45. Ward 1.
Date(s) of Hearing(s):	5/2, 5/16, 6/6, 6/20, 7/11 (re-advertised), 8/8
Staff Recommendation:	None at this time.
PB Action:	Voted on July 11, 2019 to continue to August 8, 2019.
Case Status:	Voted to continue to August 22, 2019

365 Somerville Avenue: (PB 2018-08):	
Applicant:	Nikhilsh Rao Goruknati
Property Owner:	Riggins Holdings, LLC
Agent:	N/A
Legal Notice:	Applicant, Nikhilsh Rao Goruknati, and Property Owner, Riggins Holdings, LLC, seek special permits to convert from a café use to dentist office. Parking relief under Article 9. CCD-55. Ward 2
Date(s) of Hearing(s):	7/11, 8/8
Staff Recommendation:	None at this time.
PB Action:	Voted on July 11, 2019 to continue to August 8, 2019.
Case Status:	Voted to continue to August 22, 2019

Previously Opened Cases to be Heard:

114-120 Broadway: (PB 2019-13)	
Applicant:	Goodfood Restaurant Group, LLC
Property Owner:	Goodfood Restaurant Group, LLC
Agent:	Sean O'Donovan
Legal Notice:	Applicant and Owner, Goodfood Restaurant Group, LLC, seek a Special Permit with Site Plan Review (SPSR) under §5.2 of the SZO to replace a one-story building with a 5-story mixed-use building (+/- 4,000square feet ground floor retail and 39 residential units on floors 2-5). Inclusionary units provided under Article 13of the SZO and parking relief under article 9 of the SZO. CCD45. Ward 1.
Date(s) of Hearing(s):	5/16, 6/6, 6/20, 7/11 (re-advertised), 8/8
Staff Recommendation:	Conditional approval
PB Action:	Voted on July 11, 2019 to continue to August 8, 2019.
Case Status:	Will be heard.

Sean O'Donovan, 741 Broadway, for applicant
 Gregory Mackintosh architect - Apologies for last meeting hiccup
 GMackintosh will show what changes are for having purchased 114
 Project changes from 20 market 4 inclusion, .8 pay in



To 32 market rate 7 inclusionary .8 pay in
 30 parking spaces
 Ccd55 all parcels comply

GMackintosh – Apologies for inconvenience from last meeting, will discuss project
 Increase presence along Broadway,
 6 foot alley is maintained but moved with property line
 Ground level, lobby and commercial 3800 sf
 Included shared ride parking space, from condition, included car charging
 Had to address trash collection, created enclosure for dumpsters with retractable roof and doors to have rodent protection
 Had been bicycle storage, have included room in basement for new cycle storage, now 12 cycles as opposed to 6 previous
 2nd and 3rd about same, maintained and increased privacy for neighbors with potted shrubs will be watered from internally, reduce traffic across that area, planting will create buffer
 Upper levels same 5th and roof garden below
 Volume (perceived) not changed from previous, cladding changed
 Real, not thin brick wraps corner
 Comparison between previous and current, cladding but not volume
 Renderings

MCapuano – generally appreciative that we have gotten to a place where the building looks like it belongs, not lego shaped, last time neighborhood wished something more like this
 JFavaloro – said at last meeting, echoed chair, begrudgingly voted before, knowing that we weren’t ecstatic, to the credit of the team, kept going and now a year later we have a project that reflects many of the things we would have loved to see last time, thrilled to see now
 DKelly Gay don’t have too many comments, echo Joe, knowing where you started to where finished, incredible improvement, doesn’t look like an L anymore, will be good for Broadway
 GAmaral – what is commercial spaces division? Two or three spaces
 GMackintosh – no specific tenant, imagined roughly in half, though one will have presence on glen too
 Interior demising will be determined when tenant is in, idea is to get to two

No comment from staff before testimony

Comments in favor – none
 Comments in opposition/concern - none

MCapuano – Finally, heard us and heard the neighborhood, incredibly pleased with this time around
 Staff has made a rec for conditional approval
 JFavaloro moves to accept, DKelly Gay second
 5 to 0 in favor

176-182 Broadway (PB 2017-22)	
Applicant:	Yihe Patsy’s Corporation
Property Owner:	Yihe Patsy’s Corporation
Agent:	Richard G. DiGirolamo
Legal Notice:	Applicant and Owner, Yihe Patsy’s Corporation, seeks a Special Permit with Site Plan Review (SPSR) to construct a 26-unit mixed-use building with commercial space along the street frontage and residences above. CCD-55 zone. Ward 1.
Date(s) of Hearing(s):	2018: 6/21, 8/23, 10/4, 11/8, 11/29, 12/13 2019: 1/9, 1/24, 2/7, 2/21, 3/7, 3/21, 4/4, 4/18, 5/2, 5/16, 6/6, 6/20, 7/11 (re-advertised), 8/8
Staff Recommendation:	None at this time.
PB Action:	Voted on July 11, 2019 to continue to August 8, 2019.
Current Status:	Will be heard for an advisory discussion.



MCapitano – this is an advisory discussion

See from agenda that there have been hearings and continuances for 14 months

Here at board request to see where we are, been a long time, this board had approved app several years ago, that lapsed, applicant came with different proposal, nothing done with it for a year and change

Why are we in 2019 looking at a new application for a project first in front of us in Obama administration?

Rich DiGirolamo for the applicant – Scott Pollack from Arrowstreet in place of Sean Selby who was not able to attend, but familiar with project, was second architect involved upon refile of application

Not new app, new proposal, app pending for 14 months

Last appeared June 20th, in 2014 was permitted, lapsed, extension granted which also lapsed

Application desired that it was refiled to be rental, not condo, market conditions warranted reduction in unit size so not much new sq footage but more units with ground floor commercial

Board has seen proposal, several concerns about design, number of units, not enough parking for projects, size and number of units...

MCapitano – fair to say board had problems with all of it

RDigirolamo – want board to know that this applicant and team has not stood idle, tried to come up with plan that works for owner and that city and board will work for area

Last time we appeared, pointed out that we were trying to purchase a unit that would have allowed turning radius for increased spaces, that effort failed, deal did not come to fruition, back in front of you with something much more in line with where we originally started in 2014

20 units, more traditional, board didn't ask for traditional, but looked at other things around that it didn't rhyme with, increased to 1 unit for 1 parking space, and 2 outdoor to accommodate commercial units

Would like feedback from board

MCapitano – has new design been passed by alderman and neighborhood

RDigirolamo – no, because you asked, and only finished last Wednesday, not deeply reviewed so far

We had two neighborhood meetings with councilor McLaughlin, went well, not much discontent, so will speak with councilor, but don't think that there was much neighborhood involvement, most of effort was to come up with design and configuration that would be okay with the board

MCapitano – before action will need at least one neighborhood meeting to make sure no one is caught by surprise, will need to see

SPollack – from Arrowstreet, 55 oxford street, lived there for long time, very familiar with the neighborhood

Not a finalized design, looking for feedback to be sure we're headed in the right direction

Heard a few key issues about design, have reanalyzed present day and historic condition to understand better, thought more about location as a gateway

Also listened to street front experience, how much was set back for parking, you were correct, not for best pedestrian experience, critical for someone I that far

Highly constrained site, very complex 3d challenges to design around, restricts some options

AAboff – have not seen before and would appreciate changes explained

SPollack – much more restricted setbacks due to neighborhood, impact where things can go like stair and elevator tower

Almost half of frontage was not active use, esp in this location, we flipped, moved vehicle access to different point of site, narrower throat to get down to lower entrance which allowed more parking

Overall massing not much different, defined by zoning, not much leeway

Driveway on other side gives more spatial relief, moved elevator and stair, one place allowed to go high, but also gives interesting design

Parking clearer

Floor plate not terribly different, 5 units per floor, 600sf to 1500sf

Not complete, tried to emphasize family units for more comfortable,

Third floor starts setback, fourth even further

Previous elevation, spent a lot of time looking at precedent, noticed three things to pay attention to, not faux historical but reflect tradition

Bottom, middle, top, bring back that feature, falls more into commercial than three family

Long history of towers in neighborhood, were even more, not uncommon in period, due to types of uses, firehouses needed towers to dry out hoses

Started to look at a design that had a tower, think of as gateway element, public art as part of that, reflect neighborhood, reference art institutions and Mudflat, look for help design tower that reflected arts character, design not fully developed, don't want to go to them yet, will include in process, location where we could do a current version of East Somerville sign

Building itself is now base middle top, top is back slightly, middle has balconies, rectangular form reflects traditional use in neighborhood, base reflects commercial nature
important to start bringing in east views, entrance to neighborhood, always show both views now, how will be perceived, commercial right on street to dominate, tower entrance set back a bit, much smaller

MCapuano – looks like you have increased windows on side

SPollack – yes, not look like a party wall is important, in terms of material, would like to use natural wood, brick, bronze, fiber cement that we can color, will feel warmer, looked at how older buildings have been modernized, contemporary and traditional blend

DKelly Gay – is that real brick

SPollack – not designed yet, will have to be real brick if it wraps corner, but can't tell difference otherwise

DKelly Gay – over the years we have heard that we have had enough of imitation brick, says you are cutting corners,

SPollack – hear that carefully, would be quiet, hear if we're in the right direction

JFavaloro – want to hear from colleagues first

DKelly Gay – was disappointed, didn't jump out as vast improvement, don't know about east Somerville tower, a lot more can be done, piece I do like is that commercial is right up on sidewalk, that's the only piece I like, still have a long way to go

GAmaral – agree with Dorothy, looks like a hotel on South Beach, but happier with window placement, will leave comments from neighborhood and staff

MCapuano – there are things I like and things I don't like, appreciate expanded commercial space, much more inviting and cohesive, actually like South Beach, see that, but I also see older commercial buildings in Boston, don't mind it as much, concept is okay with me, receptive, don't mind, appreciate open up side, less flat wall, windows going up, appreciate setback on top floor, like levels definition, middle - I like more traditional, doesn't look uniform enough for me, too scattered, like that there is more glass than material, can't really see side from Sullivan, appreciate that only one more unit

RDigirolamo – 3600 commercial now, more parking now,

MCapuano – and two spaces for commercial? Moving in the right direction, not as far away as colleagues, we have a plan, something that we can work with, work with neighborhood to something that we can vote on

Thank you for presentation, hope this has been helpful

AAboff – is tower completely opaque for elevator? Question the monolithic tower without glazing, will have to look closer, articulation into parts is much more contextual, appreciate that, have positive feelings about top and bottom, middle needs more work on either form or material, appreciate efforts to take comment

MCapuano – I appreciate that the professional agrees with me

AAboff - I'm not Rebecca

JFavaloro – I want to refocus, appreciate that parking is where it should be, that family units are larger, there are parts of this I can live with, appreciate, parts still need additional work, for the first time in a while there is a starting point, take comments and work with to come up with something we can support

Materials have to be real brick, appreciate more glass, looking at appreciation of what those elements are, tower is a tougher sell but I'm not just trying to blow it up, something to work with here, just don't take another year

MCapuano – if it does take another year, make it worth it

DKelly Gay –on tower, is it intent to have wood on tower

SPollack –haven't spent time because wanted to hear about idea first, one idea got us excited about art thing, hearing that art competent would be good, but make it more contextual, okay with that, part is the stair, can add articulation there, did spend time to reconceive the basic diagram of the building, making sure all things work first, if this works we can work forward on architecture, couldn't be sure we were in the right direction, very helpful, now we can move forward

MCapuano – what are dimensions of tower?

SPollack – the stair will be 8.5 feet, elevator 10 feet, so about 18 – 19 feet



Can break down the massing to make it appear less, hearing your reaction, things we can do with it
 DKelly Gay – looks odd to me, can't get head around it
 MCapuano – the reason I'm asking, it goes above, have 20 units, can use that space for something as a community space for residents to go up and out
 SPollack – always try and then run into building code, top of elevator have to have a whole other floor, would be great to have access to roof, but tower would have to get even higher, looked at it, but gets too tall and out of proportion, can't be public and usable have brother in wheelchair, so I'm very cognizant, good reasons even if not happy
 MCapuano – I have to ask the question
 SPollack – something we asked and tried
 AAboff – to clarify, functionally the stair can have glazing, don't mind the idea of public art component, but light in to that stairwell would be good not opposition to art
 SPollack – thanks, very helpful
 Rich – appreciate input from board, will go back and regroup, does board have timelines, suggestions
 MCapuano given you suggestions, when you get to point where you want to come back to staff, go ahead till you get to something staff is comfortable with, and will play by ear with that
 RDiGirolamo – will board want to kick out two meetings,
 MCapuano – next two meetings will be jammed, let's take up in September, that will be doable, if not, after October
 SPollack – can be here in September 5th, that is reasonable
 MCapuano – okay, thanks

New Cases to be Heard:

6 Broadway (PB 2019-16)	
Applicant:	Philadelphia Sign Co.
Property Owner:	LaCourt Enterprises LLC
Agent:	Adam Dash, Esq.
Legal Notice:	Applicant, Philadelphia Sign Co., and Owner, LaCourt Enterprises LLC, seek a special permit under SZO §6.5.D.5.a to install signage and an awning for an automated teller machine (ATM) on the ground floor of the building. TOD55 Zone. Ward 1.
Date(s) of Hearing(s):	8/8
Staff Recommendation:	Conditional approval
PB Action:	--
Case Status:	<p>Adam Dash for Philly Sign company ATM at vacant space, chase bank need relief for awning and signage Awning is in question, asking for approval but may not build it Least controversial of items in front of board</p> <p>AMello first condition has details for both, if they choose not to do its okay for them to leave off, would be considered de minimus by planning director</p> <p>Open to those in favor – none Open to those in opposition/concern - none</p> <p>Discussion Motion to approve DKelly Gay second by JFavaloro 5 to 0 in favor</p>

9 Sanborn Court (PB 2019-17)	
Applicant:	Sara Markey
Property Owner:	EJH Realty LLC c/o Edward Kepnes
Agent:	N/A
Legal Notice:	Applicant, Sara Markey, and Owner, EJH Realty LLC c/o Edward Kepnes, seeks a special permit under SZO §6.1.22.D.6 to conduct a portion of the business outdoors by installing a patio. CCD-55/Arts Overlay Zone. Ward 3.
Date(s) of Hearing(s):	8/8
Staff Recommendation:	None at this time.
PB Action:	--
Case Status:	Will be heard.

Sara Markey – Field and vine restaurant manager for temp outdoor patio, in place of outdoor parking
 Sectioned off by moveable structure, footprint will take up less space than cars there
 Better our business, improve outdoor, keep biz within square
 MCapuano – what is the definition of temporary here
 Sara Markey – Just for warmer months of the year, May to October
 MCapuano – applciation and permit will run with property and not with tenant
 Sara Markey – I’m confused
 MCapuano – if we give permit, we are giving it to building, and anyone afterward can use that patio as well, less temorary than you think, concern is taking two spaces currently used by restaurant, do you own?
 Sara Markey – Don't own but spaces are in lease
 MCapuano – owner of property owns, my concern is taking away parking spaces, because USq doesn't have enough, those coming after you may need to use them, folks that park there now are from the restaurant, taking in perpetuity no matter who is there
 Sara Markey – In applying for this, can that be condition of the permit, to limit only to Field and Vine
 MCapuano – can't tie to specific tenant, has to be applied to property, have correspondence from abutters, they have concerns about legal change to use without permission of all abutters, not sure if those are valid but this board can't make that determination about property, court has to decide as to legal rights to Sanborn Court
 Concerns are a few, loss of space of two spaces, understand that patio will take less space, movability will make it easier to alleviate congestion, but my concerns is what happens when it is no longer you but next user who wants to use that space, but they drive from outside the city and also need to use the parking, are they going to go to parking garage, take up spots from other people trying to park, not as simple as just ‘we would like to have a patio’, bigger and longer term use of the space and how it relates to union square more broadly
 Don't want to overstate concern, so listen to see what colleagues have to say, have to see what staff thinks about temporary permitting of for space for only a year, want to see if we can limit

GAmaral – think this is an issue of safety and private way, can't say how things would work but do know that having emergency accessibility could be an issue in that small space, read letters, would like to hear from direct abutters before any decision, still safety issue is one of my biggest concerns
 Sara Markey – can explain safety issue?
 GAmaral – fire lane is one concern, need room for fire apparatus to turn around, maybe staff can elaborate

AMello – reached out to fire prevention, have not commented yet, in other instances of zoning board, with units behind units, they have been comfortable with aisles of 12 feet, thinking changes over time and with new personnel, in past previous chiefs preferred width for a whole truck, current chief doesn't think we would need a truck that they would bring hoses up there, think they have not commented because they don't have any think they would have intervened with Bronwyn patio



Sara Markey – To follow up, does show that there is adequate space for truck to pull all the way back, would not be changing the way the court is right now, won't exacerbate

MCapuano – when fire department has had concern with access, they tend to make themselves known, when asked specifically by board, they have given formal responses to be incorporated, at Lexington example, was house behind house, concern to be able to get to back dwelling unit, we all had concerns, fire had been silent, we asked for formal response if they could access, might be where we are going, before we sign off will want to get formal input from fire department, won't vote without formal recommendation one way or another, would be helpful to me
AMello – will reach out to them

DKelly Gay – think that is a very congested area down there, with food truck delivery, also thinking about dumpster down there, the access to all that, especially when the cars are parked at back of old police station, very tight can't even envision space, fire safety is utmost, but find it difficult when it is a private way, always understood as, abutters have worked things out amongst themselves, some compromise can be reached if there is a fire safety issue that is cleaned up, complicated, delivery trucks, beer trucks, may be too many, too big, several questions, have to explore more

AAboff – have none of the concerns about parking, but do want fire input, especially with density of uses, share congestion use as well, with deliveries at time of day when people are not likely to be parked there, but challenge is not taking them offline part of the day but that they would be offline all the time, not sure about larger vehicles to turn around in that space, seems an even trade off on paper, but seems to be impeded more than usual, also like staff to explain what Bronwyn got so that we can make determinations that are equal

JFavaloro – not ready to vote now, but Sanborn presents challenges, at a whole different level, normally when I see outdoor seating I want to do it, as a good thing, for union and anywhere in the city, but first and foremost need fire department involved to see that the additional challenges this is going to bring, hope that when this comes back on the agenda, that parties can get together and find things they are in agreement about so that while we get some answers you can get some as well

MCapuano – have raised question, you have some answers, not ready to vote tonight, if you don't have anything further?

Sara Markey – Just about the parking in front of the restaurant, would not be in use during the hours that the patio would be in use, only removing cars from part of the day is different than 24 hours, with regard to path that trucks, etc need to take, something to take in consideration with deliveries, can touch on, deliveries are not supposed to come back to Sanborn, supposed to park in loading zones, those situations arise where people are in places they are not supposed to be, happens on both sides of alleys, not supposed to be there anyway

AAboff – useful, thanks

Sara Markey – We're just going to wait, will be continued fire department will be able to reach a conclusion?

MCapuano – hope to address by 22nd

Comments in favor

Henry Patterson, master lease holder of entire building for field and vine since 1977, was vacant auto body at the time turned into my own restaurant, from 1991 to today, have leased to best restaurant operators I could find, tenants have won many awards for best restaurants

Petitioned city for storefront improvement in 2011 that is now Bronwyn to build that patio, abutters both approved of that, fire department at that time that since the private way is 30 feet wide that it was 18 feet needed, have been told 12 is adequate, had no problem honoring that, Bronwyn is 10 feet wide, Independent used 3 feet for plantings but 18 feet is left clear,

This proposed patio would not extend even to 10 feet, will get ruling from fire but very confident that lane is more than adequate, was not an issue then and should not be now

Have entire east side, have permitted tenants to park there, currently used by business owners not guests, will give up amenity for their guests, if I had my way would make it a walking street to make more inviting to guests, in 2002 persuaded Ken Kelly and Don Warner to consolidate trash and administered dumpster, paid bills and didn't charge for administration just charged for use, in 2013 Warner changed that, no warning, so reason we have dumpsters there is because we have nowhere else to put them, have to pull up Sanborn to empty, have it in their contract to come early in the morning, but constraints mean they come later in the day, sometimes block access to parking lot, have tried to meet with Warner to reconsolidate with fridge for garbage, can't even get a meeting, don't know what to say about objection, will actually be an enhancement to area, amenity will be deserved by operators of excellent restaurant that is well appreciated by neighborhood, Independent has taken up three spaces for patio, I endorsed, spoke in favor, outdoor presence is in interest of community more than parking, endorsed change of the jungle in, warner enjoys plaza with 8x what we are proposing, have a hard time not getting emotional about the objection Have been there for 42 years, not going anywhere, wanted to help understand more about context

MCapitano – appreciate, but this is testimony, not questions here, but appreciate the context in testimony

Bronwyn Whiteman, owner, Neighbor, worked with them in other restaurants, colleagues here to talk about biz spaces that would become patio, rent one from Henry, have already made move to not drive, use scooter, an outdoor patio is powerful for a small restaurant, Bronwyn's brings joy to the square, brings financial help during long summer season, takes you out of the running for competition, she would have wonderful patio for the neighborhood, want to give my space to her

Robyn Kelly, Neighbor, frequent guests at restaurant, visited when they had permit for patio, echo comment about liveliness, valuable human interaction down to other spaces in Sanborn court, in spirit of what is going on there, with regard to future tenants not having parking, lots of legacy buildings don't have parking and people figure it out, have city bikes, many bus routes, not necessary to have parking right out front, taking away for season would not be negative impact to someone like me who is there all the time, concern about fire will be addressed, if there are cars there now, trucks maneuver around them now, patio would be smaller, easier to move than a car, in the event of an emergency, please consider favorably as a neighbor, patron, resident of Union Square, homeowner in the area, this will be a great addition

Comments in opposition/concern - none

MCapitano – no additional comments, is the will of board to have formal input from fire department, may be highly likely to sign off but want to see that abutters concerns are properly weighted before we vote

Continue to August 22nd meeting

Seconded by JFavaloro, 5 to 0 in favor

181 Washington Street (ZBA 2019-14)	
Applicant:	181 Washington St, LLC
Property Owner:	181 Washington Street, aka 185 Washington Street, Unit 1
Agent:	Adam Dash, Esq.
Legal Notice:	Applicant, 181 Washington St, LLC, and Owner, 181 Washington Street, aka 185 Washington Street, Unit 1, seek Special Permits for a dental office. Parking relief under Article 9 of the SZO. CCD-55 zone. Ward 3.
Date(s) of Hearing(s):	8/8
Staff Recommendation:	Conditional approval
PB Action:	--
Case Status:	<p>Adam Dash Don't need parking relief, was an error in notice, not a legal problem but need permission to put dental office in location, use question only Meeting with neighborhood council, recommended support, unanimous in favor via straw poll New mixed use building, commercial condo on first floor, will be buying unit and staying for long haul Been vacant for some time, trouble attracting a tenant Submitted signage plans, same as barber shop next door, blade and a flat sign to match what is there Dr Abdul takes lots of low income folks, outlined in neighborhood council letter Will mesh with tenants of the building, not many who take commonwealth care etc. Very passionate about caring for low income folks as well as market rate</p> <p>MCapuano want to make clear that my office does work with mass health but there is no conflict DKelly Gay welcome change, much needed in union sq, exp as people move in and look for services Need more diversity, all the services, pleased to hear and will vote in favor JFavaloro – happy that it is commitment to ownership, AAboff – echo Joe’s comments, no other input</p> <p>Comments in favor – none Comments in opposition/concern - none</p> <p>MCapuano moves to adopt staff recommendation as conditions, second AAboff 5 – 0 in favor</p>

Other Business

Approval of Minutes:

June 13, 2019

July 11, 2019

The discussion of these minutes was continued to August 22, 2019

NOTICE: While reasonable efforts have been made to assure the accuracy of the data provided in these minutes, do not rely on this information as the complete and accurate portrayal of the events in the meeting without first checking with the Planning Division staff. If any discrepancies exist, the decisions filed by the Board serve as the relevant record for each case. The Planning Division also maintains audio recordings of most Board meetings that are available upon request.

