

CITY OF NEWTON
IN BOARD OF ALDERMEN
LAND USE COMMITTEE REPORT
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 2014

Present: Ald. Laredo (Chairman), Ald. Albright, Cote, Crossley, Lennon, Lipof, Harney, and Schwartz; also present: Ald. Leary
Staff: Stephen Pantalone (Chief Planner), Ouida Young (Associate City Solicitor), Linda Finucane (Assistant Clerk of the Board)

Public Hearings were opened on the following items:

#272-14 CHRISTINE BOISCLAIR petition for a SPECIAL PERMIT/SITE PLAN APPROVAL to EXTEND A NONCONFORMING STRUCTURE to construct a portico of approximately 4.5 feet over the front entrance at 42 BRAE BURN ROAD, Ward 4, Auburndale, on land known as SBL 43, 5, 2, containing approximately 9,095 sf of land in a district zoned SINGLE RESIDENCE 2. Ref: Sec 30-24, 30-23, 30-15 Table 1, 30-21(b) of the City of Newton Rev Zoning Ord, 2012.

ACTION: HEARING CLOSED; APPROVED 8-0

NOTE: The petitioner is seeking relief to extend the existing nonconforming circa 1931 single-family dwelling by reducing the front setback from 21.2 feet to 17.08 feet, where 25 feet is required, in order to build a portico over the front entrance. Measuring approximately 38.7 square feet, with two wood support columns and an asphalt roof, consistent with the style of the house, the proposed portico will provide protection from the elements. There was no public comment and in working session, Alderman Harney moved approval, which carried unanimously with the findings and conditions contained in draft special permit #272-14, dated October 6, 2014.

#274-14 GATEWAY CENTER REALTY TRUST petition for a SPECIAL PERMIT/SITE PLAN APPROVAL to replace and legalize an existing freestanding sign at 296-334 WASHINGTON STREET (Gateway Center), Ward 1, Newton Corner, on land known as SBL 12, 11, 1, in a district zoned BUSINESS 1. Ref: Sec 30-24, 30-23, 30-20(l) of the City of Newton Rev Zoning Ord and special permit #270-67.

ACTION: HEARING CLOSED; APPROVED 8-0

NOTE: The property is known as One Gateway Center and includes a hotel, restaurant, and parking facility approved by special permit in 1967 and built over the Mass Turnpike. A condition included in the special permit requires all exterior signs be approved by the Board of Aldermen. The petitioner is seeking to replace and legalize an existing freestanding sign. The sign is on the north side of the building facing Washington Street. The sign contains approximately 26 square feet of sign area, with "One Gateway Center." There was no public comment and in working session Alderman Lennon moved approval, which carried

unanimously, with the findings and conditions contained in draft special permit #274-14, dated October 6, 2014.

#257-13(4) WELLS AVENUE BUSINESS CENTER LLC petition for a SPECIAL PERMIT/SITE PLAN APPROVAL to permit a “place of amusement,” an indoor bouncy house, in an existing building housing a day care and to waive 7 parking stalls, reduce minimum aisle width for one-way traffic and waive interior landscaping requirements at 145 WELLS AVENUE, Ward 8, on land known as SBL 84, 34, 2G, containing approximately 86,256 sf of land in a district zoned LIMITED MANUFACTURING. Ref: Sec 30-24, 30-23, 30-5(a)(3)d)iii, 30-12(e)(8), 30-19(d)(13), and(16), 30-19(h)(3)a), 30-19(i)(2), 30-19(m) of the City of Newton Rev Zoning Ord, 2012. NOTE: Accompanying petition #257-13(3) requests that the restriction adopted by Board Order #276-68(3), dated November 18, 1968, and subsequent amendments be further amended to reflect a waiver of use restriction to permit an interior place of amusement

ACTION: HEARING CLOSED; APPROVED 8-0

NOTE: The petitioner was represented by attorney Terrence Morris. The site is located within the Wells Avenue Office Park. The petitioner received administrative site plan approval for a day care center in 2013. The Newton Childcare Academy (NCA), the day care operator, comprises approximately 12,000 square feet and is seeking to use the remaining 5,700 square feet for an indoor bouncy house business, which is considered “a place of amusement” for which a special permit is needed. In addition, the petitioner is seeking to further amend the Deed Restriction to allow a place of amusement.

The petitioner is proposing several changes to the existing 30-stall parking lot. Proposed changes include expanding the parking area, increasing the number of stalls to 45, and striping an area in the center of the parking lot to create one-way circulation. The petitioner is also seeking relief from interior landscaping requirements and to reduce the minimum aisle width for one-way traffic. As the site falls within the 100-foot buffer zone of a perennial intermittent stream bed, it requires review by the Conservation Commission, which has given preliminary approval. The addition of the new use and the proposed expansion of the NCA from 70 children to 120 children increase the required number of parking stalls to 52, for which the petitioner is seeking a waiver of seven stalls.

The Planning Department has no particular concerns. Day care uses are generally allowed in all zoning districts and in this location it is complementary to the existing office uses. Moreover, the bouncy house, which can accommodate 15 children, will be an accessory use that will only be open nights and weekends. It believes the number of existing parking stalls and the seven-stall waiver are appropriate since the parking demands for the two uses should not overlap.

The Planning Department and the Transportation Division reviewed the site plan and do not believe the proposed striped virtual center island provides any significant improvement in circulation. In fact, it may be used by parents for parking, which would cause a hazard. Both departments agreed that the conversion to one-way circulation is neither a benefit nor a detriment. The Fire Department is concerned that the existing lot is already narrow. Fire trucks would likely have to back out of the lot regardless of whether an island is created or not. The

Fire Department wants a passable aisle width of at least 12 feet along the building. The Planning Department suggests that landscaping within a portion of the proposed “island” would provide more value to the site from an aesthetic and environmental perspective. Landscaping would discourage parking as well as allow reasonable fire access.

There was no public comment.

In working session, the petitioner stated there will be 15 minutes between the end of one event/party and the beginning of another. Hours of operation will be 6:00 PM to 9:00 PM weekdays and 9:00 AM to 7:00 PM weekends. The bouncy house and the daycare will not operate at the same time. The petitioner agreed to provide landscaping within the center and to retain the two-way circulation.

Alderman Lipof moved approval of the petition with the findings and conditions enumerated in draft special permit #257-13(4), dated October 6, 2014, which motion carried unanimously.

#257-13(3) WELLS AVENUE BUSINESS CENTER LLC requesting that the restriction adopted by Board Order #276-68(3), dated November 18, 1968, and subsequent amendments be further amended to reflect a waiver of use restriction to permit an interior place of amusement at 145 WELLS AVENUE, Ward 8. *NOTE: Public Hearing not required.*

ACTION: APPROVED 8-0

#316-14 KATHLEEN CURRAN petition for a SPECIAL PERMIT/SITE PLAN APPROVAL to EXTEND A NONCONFORMING STRUCTURE to construct a 2-story addition including an attached 2-car garage with living space above with a dormer wider than 50% of the wall below at 30 HANCOCK STREET, Ward 4, Auburndale, on land known as SBL 43, 17, 17, containing approximately 13,950 sf of land in a district zoned SINGLE RESIDENCE 3. Ref: Sec 30-24, 30-23, 30-15 Table 1, 30-15(t)(1), 30-21(b) of the City of Newton Rev Zoning Ord, 2012.

ACTION: HEARING CLOSED; APPROVED 8-0

NOTE: The site is improved with a nonconforming 2½-story single-family residence constructed in 1896, originally used as a carriage house on a large estate. The structure is situated on the corner of the property and is nonconforming relative to front, side and rear setbacks. The petitioner wishes to enlarge the house by adding a two-story addition consisting of a two-car garage, first floor living space, and bedrooms and bath above. The existing structure contains approximately 1,714 gross square feet. Although the proposed addition is approximately 2,254 square feet, it does not encroach further into the existing nonconforming rear and side setbacks; however, in order to construct a functional living space above the garage, the petitioner is seeking relief to construct a dormer, which will exceed the allowable fifty percent length of the story below. The Auburndale Historic District Commission reviewed the proposed addition and issued a Certificate of Appropriateness for the project. The dormer is proposed on the rear of the proposed addition and is approximately 18.6 feet in length and has a 23.5 foot long wall below. The dormer will be partially visible from Grove Street.

Several abutters sent emails in support of the project. There was no public comment.

In working session, Alderman Harney moved approval of the petition, which carried unanimously with the findings and conditions contained in draft special permit #316-14, dated October 6, 2014.

Hearing opened on July 29, continued to September 16:

#318-13(3) RODNEY D. FARNSWORTH III petition for a SPECIAL PERMIT/SITE PLAN APPROVAL to create an accessory apartment in part of an finished living space in the basement at 161 EDINBORO STREET, Ward 2, NEWTONVILLE on land known as SBL 21, 23 18, containing approximately 17,496 sf of land in a district zoned MULTI RESIDENCE 1. Ref: Sec 30-24, 30-23, 30-9(h)(2) of the City of Newton Rev Zoning Ord, 2012.

ACTION: HEARING CLOSED; APPROVED 8-0

NOTE: The public hearing was opened on July 29. The petitioner was represented by attorney Mark Lanza. This property was the subject of a previous zoning enforcement action heard by the Zoning Board of Appeals. The petitioner filed an appeal with Land Court, which ordered him to apply for a special permit for an accessory apartment. The petitioner decided to not continue the battle and filed this application for an accessory apartment. The subject property contains a two-family, 1- 2½ story dwelling, an attached garage and a detached garage. The original single-family structure was built circa 1900. The addition of the second unit, which is connected by an unenclosed deck, was constructed in approximately 1989. The petitioner had been using the basement of the addition as an illegal accessory apartment prior to receiving a violation notice from the Inspectional Services Department. The petitioner is seeking relief for an accessory apartment in the basement. The site plan shows ten parking stalls on the site, which includes parking within the attached and detached garages and in the driveway. It appears there is adequate parking for the three units.

There was a question of whether the unenclosed deck meets the existing requirement for a common wall connector. Without a common wall connector the structure is not considered a two-family and would be noncompliant.

There was also a question of whether the petitioner resides at the property. The petitioner said he lives in the rear unit, but for health reasons spends winters in a warmer climate. In the past he has had house sitters occupy the accessory apartment, which had to be vacated when the zoning enforcement action was taken. The committee asked the petitioner to provide a floor clarifying the egress from the proposed accessory apartment.

Public comment:

Janet Sterman, 120 Church Street, Newton Corner, is a realtor who spoke in favor of the petition.

Robert Krauss, 166 Edinboro Street, has lived across the street for 25 years. There is much talk about accessory apartments, but little done. The middle class is being edged out of Newton. The petitioner has been a wonderful neighbor and when able he used to clear snow from at least four other houses on the street.

Ralph Robart, 48 Arlo Road, a 60-year resident agreed. This is the type of unit that provides affordable housing. A building permit was issued for the second unit with the uncovered deck. Why is its legality an issue?

Since the accessory apartment ordinance requires the property to be owner-occupied, the petitioner was asked to provide an affidavit relative to his residency.

This evening, the Planning Department confirmed that the building permit plans for the second unit were approved by the city in 1989. The connecting deck was built prior to 2002, when in response to concerns about so-called “linguine” attachments the Board approved ordinance X-38, which created and/or amended definitions for *Common roof connector*, *Common wall connector*, *Dwellings, attached*, and *Dwelling, two-family*. The structure is a legal nonconforming two-family dwelling.

The petitioner provided an affidavit in which he identified various registrations such as driver’s license, passport, etc. at the property. He is listed on the city census and is a registered voter in Newton. Under duress, Mr. Farnsworth stated that he files Massachusetts resident income taxes.

The petitioner provided a floor plan on which it appears the egress from the accessory apartment goes through a common area, up a set of stairs, and through the garage. The Inspectional Services Department has a number of concerns about this egress. It also has concerns about the height of the window wells in the basement. In addition, the petitioner may need to provide an updated land survey, as the survey filed with this application was completed in 1989. That said, these are building code issues, not issues related to the use of the land.

Alderman Albright moved approval of the petition finding the site is an appropriate location for an accessory apartment and will not adversely affect the neighborhood; there will be no nuisance or serious hazard to vehicles or pedestrians as there is adequate parking on-site; access to the site is appropriate for the types and number of vehicles. The motion to approve carried unanimously.

Hearing opened on July 29, 201, continued to September 16:

#229-14 MICHAEL & DENA RASHES petition for a SPECIAL PERMIT/SITE PLAN APPROVAL to EXTEND a NONCONFORMING STRUCTURE to add approximately 2,372 sq. ft. to the rear of an existing dwelling, which is nonconforming as to height, ~~and to relocate the existing detached garage from the western side of the property to the eastern side of the property and~~ to construct an attached three-car garage, and to waive preservation and conservation restrictions and to amend special permit #127-80(2), at 93 BELLEVUE STREET, Ward 1, NEWTON, on land known as SBL 12, 21, 39 and 40, containing approximately 93,923 sq. ft. of land in a district zoned SINGLE RESIDENCE 2. Ref: Sec 30-24, 30-23, 30-21(b), 30-8(b)(7), 30-15 Table 1 of the City of Newton Rev Zoning Ord, 2012.

ACTION: HEARING CLOSED; APPROVED 8-0

NOTE: The public hearing was opened on July 29. The petitioners are represented by attorney Stephen Buchbinder. The subject property consists of two lots. Lot 39 is approximately 46,349 square feet and is improved with an 11,275 square-foot single-family dwelling constructed

c.1875, which is on the National Register, and a detached garage constructed in 1995. Lot 40 is approximately 47,574 square feet of open space and vegetation. The site was originally part of the Riley Estate, which also included the carriage house at Lot 38, 99-109 Bellevue Street, which was converted to a six-unit condominium by special permit #127-80(2). The petitioners access the detached garage through an easement over Lot 38, which ends at the driveway in front of their house. However, they continue to access their garage from the front of their house through Lot 38, even though the access easement does not extend the full length of the existing driveway. It is the petitioners' intent to abandon the existing easement if this special permit is approved.

The petitioners are doing extension restoration work to the house and the property. Special permit #127-80 placed certain conditions on lots 38, 39, and 40, including preservation and conservation restrictions limiting additional development. Originally, the petitioners were seeking a waiver from the preservation restriction, but have withdrawn the request to relocate the existing garage to the east side (Lot 39) of the property. Lot 40 has a conservation restriction that prohibits its subdivision and/or construction of a structure; however, a driveway is not considered a structure. The Planning Department notes that the intent of the original special permit was to maintain the estate-like feeling of the three original lots and to limit additional development on the site. The Historical Commission reviewed and approved the proposed plans. However, the Planning Department is concerned that the extent of the proposed changes may not be consistent with the original intent.

The proposed 2,373 square foot addition will contain a three-car garage, a mudroom, rooms on the second floor and a terrace. The existing crushed stone driveway in front of the house will be expanded to a circular drive. The proposed driveway materials will be cobbles with a gravel edge and the heated portion will be an aggregate material. The proposed addition will replicate the architecture and details of the existing house with the use of Milford Pink granite. The addition will not be visible from the public way.

The petitioners are seeking relief to increase the height of the structure from 42.6 feet to approximately 44.91 feet, where .36 feet is the maximum allowed. The average grade of the surrounding topography will change from 202.58 feet to 200.31 feet with the construction of the addition. The change in grade impacts the average grade plane raise the height of the structure, which increases its nonconforming height. Additional relief sought is to amend the existing special permit #127-80.

The petitioners are proposing to remove four trees for the new driveway: one ash, two hemlocks, and one maple. It is their intent to replicate a Victorian garden. A number of other trees and shrubs will be transplanted and additional plantings installed. The Director of Urban Forestry has walked the property and agrees that the trees proposed for removal are not in good health.

Public comment:

Richard Griffin, 76 Bennington Street, is a direct abutter and does not support the petition. As an architect, former city planner, and chairman of the Urban Design Commission, he is concerned with maintaining the character and appearance of the original estate.

Steve Bergman, 75 Bellevue, also a direct abutter, is concerned with the site design issue. He strongly objects to the driveway being brought closer to his property and nearer to the converted carriage house where he writes. The original driveway contributes to the original feel of the site.

Note: Mr. Bergman retained attorney Terrence Morris; however, Mr. Morris had to recuse himself from representing Mr. Bergman because the Conflict of Interest law bans him for life from such involvement because he was Chairman of the Land Use Committee in 1980 when the original special permit was approved.

David Rosmarin, 105 Bellevue Street, spoke on behalf of the carriage house condo association. The association will be pleased if the petitioners stop using the existing driveway. They have been living for a year with construction vehicles traversing over their property. It is an abuse of any possible inferred lower easement. There is noise from so many vehicles on the gravel as well as wear and tear. Stonecutting has been ongoing, starting at 7:00 a.m. The proposed location of the HVAC unit is too close their property.

William Roesner, an architect and member of the Historical Commission, believes the current plans differ from the plans presented to the Commission. He does not recall a circular drive or a driveway through the woods. Will a heated driveway damage tree roots?

Steven Zeitels, 100 Bellevue Street, a 9-year resident, said he was aware of the plans and completely supports the petitioners. The proposal respects the historical importance of the property. The petitioners have a right to have a garage and an independent driveway.

George Nadaff, bought the subject property in 1971, obtained the special permit in 1980, and lived in the house for 43 years. He noted that there was a glass conservatory where the existing detached garage is located. The only issue he had living there was parking. He supports the petition.

Steve Fishman, manager of NOF Maxim LLC that owns 121 Bellevue Street, believes it is great project for the street.

Patricia Hinchey, 102 Bellevue Street, #4, said the speakers in favor of the project are not abutters. Mr. Nadaff sold the house. The driveway is condo property.

Aviva Sapers, 115 Bellevue Street, is very much in favor of the project. The house and property are being preserved. The petitioners have a right to access their garage.

Alexandra Simes, 25 Claremont Street, fully supports the petition. The house is spectacular. The petitioners are restoring its historical integrity. Yes, construction does involve traffic, but it will end.

Wendy Sagnella, 99 Bellevue Street, #5, said she is the closest condo owner, 15 feet from property line. She does not begrudge her neighbors, but a two-story structure is imposing.

This evening, the committee discussed the proposed driveway. The driveway has been moved slightly and there are two options: a 14-foot driveway with a gravel portion and the rest remaining heated to the garage or a 12-foot drive, heated all the way. The petitioners wish to create a bump out to allow two cars to pass. The bump out was proposed to be 20-feet wide, but they have agreed to 18 feet. The Planning Department noted that a heated driveway is a benefit to the environment because it uses less salt and sand. Alderman Lipof suggested that it should be left up to the petitioners whether or not they wish to heat the entire drive. Alderman Crossley asked whether the drive was stamped concrete. The petitioners explained that the material is exposed aggregate concrete intended to look and feel like gravel, keeping with the period of the house. The driveway will be heated to slightly above freezing and will not damage tree and shrub roots. Alderman Crossley expressed some reservations about the drive in front of the house. Is the oval necessary? She also suggested that perhaps the driveway could be located in an alternate location; however, the alternate location would require removing an extensive amount of vegetation, which the circular drive does not involve, and cutting through the existing historic stone wall. There was a question of whether the city engineer would approve a second curb cut adjacent to the condo curb cut. The committee was persuaded that the proposed location is preferable.

The committee discussed the height of the house. However, there is no increase in the Floor Area Ratio and no encroachment into the setbacks. Although there was no shadow study provided, there should be no impact as the condos are slightly higher. The petitioners will install additional landscaping along the condo property line where there is already an existing row of arborvitae.

As to the preservation restriction, Ms. Young said it refers to the condo and the main house. It is difficult to know 34 years later what the intent was and what the Board was attempting to do. The garage is not clearly prohibited. The grading around the new garage is making the main nonconforming house technically taller. The Conservation Restriction on Lot 40 does not prohibit a driveway.

It was noted that because the condo building is offset, it does not align with the proposed addition, and will not impact the condo building's view. Also, the petitioners pointed out that the proposed HVAC, which will be screened and if technically feasible baffled, is 65 feet from the nearest residence. The condenser for the condos is 9 feet from the petitioners' property line and is unscreened. All exterior lighting will comply with the city's light ordinance.

Should the special permit be approved, the petitioners' propose to construct the driveway as soon as possible and abandon the existing easement. Also, if approved, all future stone cutting will be done in the garage and will not begin until 8:00 a.m. and none on weekends. The petitioners will replace the gravel on the existing driveway. The petitioners agreed to retain a certified arborist for the duration of construction of the driveway to ensure the health of the trees and will continue a "look back" period of five years on the condo side of the property.

Public comment:

David Rosmarin, 105 Bellevue Street, on behalf of the carriage house condo association asked if the condos would hear any noise from whatever will heat the driveway. It was explained that a boiler, the same as a residential boiler, inside the garage will heat the driveway to approximately 35°.

Mr. Rosmarin said there have been hundreds of trucks over the past year of construction. He wants no further trucks using the driveway.

Pat Hinchey, 102 Bellevue Street, #4, also representing the condo association, said there had been no communication from the petitioners, although Mr. Bergman, another abutter, was contacted by the petitioners' attorney. The association wants the petitioners to immediately cease using the lower driveway for construction vehicles.

The petitioners met with two condo owners, who submitted letters in favor of the petitioner, and spoke with several others. All communications from the petitioners and abutters, including the statement from Ms. Hinchey this evening, are available online at www.ci.newton.ma under Current Special Permits/93 Bellevue Street #229-14.

Alderman Lennon moved approval of the petition with the findings and conditions contained in draft special permit #229-14, dated October 6, 2014. The motion to approve carried 8-0.

#275-14 BRIGHT HORIZONS CHILDRENS CENTERS/320 NEEDHAM DE, LLC.
petition for a SPECIAL PERMIT/SITE PLAN APPROVAL to waive 20 23 parking stalls, to locate parking stalls within a setback, to waive landscape, lighting, and surfacing requirements for the parking lot and to waive the requirement for bicycle parking facilities in order to locate a child care center at 230 NEEDHAM STREET, Ward 8, in a district zoned MIXED USE 1. Ref: Sec 30-24, 30-23, 39-19(d)(13), (h), (i), (j), (k), 30-5(a)(3)d), 30-19(m) of the City of Newton Rev Zoning Ord, 2012.

ACTION: HEARING CONTINUED TO SEPTEMBER 23, 2014

NOTE: The petitioner was represented by attorney Alan Schlesinger. The subject property contains a two-story, approximately 41,780 square-foot office building. There are two parking lots on two levels. The lower level is accessed from Christina Street and the upper level is accessed from Needham Street. There is no vehicular access from the upper level to the lower level. The only exterior modification proposed is a new door on the side of the building

The petitioner wishes to use approximately 11,060 square feet on the first floor for *Bright Horizons Family Solutions*, a day care for children, and a portion of the parking lot for a play area. There are 166 parking stalls on the site. 123 parking stalls are required for the existing and proposed uses on the site. The petitioner proposes to remove 23 stalls to create the play area, which reduces the number of stalls below the number required. The day care use is allowed by-right in any zoning district through the administrative site plan review process, but the petitioner needs a special permit to waive the number of required parking stalls.

The proposed play area will be located in a fenced in area of the lower level parking lot in the northeast corner of the site. The Planning Department and the Transportation Division agree this

is the best location as it is separated from the main parking area on the lower level and it will have a minimal impact on vehicular circulation. The petitioner is proposing to remove the existing asphalt from the area and replace it with a permeable surface. The portion of the parking lot surrounding the area will be reconfigured and restriped. The petitioner will provide a crosswalk from the building to the play area. The proposed play area will be enclosed and screened with fencing and vegetation, planter boxes, and plant strips for water retention. The dumpsters are located in the northeast corner. They are fenced with a gate. Transformers are located there as well. The petitioner is proposing to create a passageway to the play area by using six removable bollards parallel to the fence. The dumpsters are either emptied early in the morning or after 6:00 p.m. The 12 stalls closest to the building would be designated for drop off only during certain hours. The play area requires approval from the Conservation Commission because the site is located within 200 feet of a riverfront. The petitioner is presenting the petition to the Commission on September 18.

Parking data provided by the petitioner based on data from a similarly sized center indicates that peak parking demand - approximately 37 stalls – for this site will be less than the parking stalls required. The Planning Department conducted several site visits during evening and morning peak operating hours of the day care use and counted at least 60 vacant parking stalls in the lower level during those hours. The building is fully leased except for the day care center. The Planning Department believes that based on the available data there appears to be sufficient parking on the site to accommodate the waiver.

Jessica King, Regional Manager for Bright Horizons, said Bright Horizons is based in Watertown and has 800 centers nationwide. Newton will have up to 122 children ranging from infants, toddlers, and pre-school, and 25 employees at one time. It will operate five days a week from approximately 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. The number of drop off spots is the number provided at the Wellesley center, which works well.

There was no public comment.

The committee had concerns about the location of the dumpsters, the proximity of three parking stalls to the play space, and snow storage. Members questioned whether there was enough room to safely back out of the three stalls. Perhaps those spaces could be designated for the director and other staff who do not come and go all day. The committee asked the petitioner whether the dumpster could be moved to another location on the site. The petitioner agreed to look at alternative locations for the dumpsters. The hearing was continued to September 23.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Marc C. Laredo, Chairman