



Land Use Committee Report

City of Newton In City Council

Tuesday, February 7, 2023

Present: Councilors Lipof (Chair), Kelley, Bowman, Greenberg, Laredo, Lucas, and Markiewicz

Also Present: Councilors Albright, Leary, Malakie, Norton, Oliver, and Wright

Absent: Councilor Downs

City Staff Present: Senior Planner Cat Kemmett, Senior Planner Michael Gleba, Chief Planner Katie Whewell, and Assistant City Solicitor Jonah Temple

All Special Permit Plans, Designs, Plan Memoranda and Application Materials can be found at the following link [NewGov - City of Newton Land Use Committee Special Permit Search](#).

The full video of the February 7, 2023 Land Use Meeting can be found at the following link: [02-07-2023 NewTV Land Use Committee Meeting](#).

Time stamps for each petition in the above video link are next to their respective headings.

#559-22 Class 2 Auto Dealers License

KC AUTO
55 Farwell Street
Newton, MA 02460

Action: Land Use Denied 7-0

Note: The last time Petition #559-22 was before the Committee was on January 10, 2023. Since that time the Committee received written correspondence from a Mr. Tom Ryan who was a patron of KC Auto. Mr. Ryan outlined in a letter his dealings with Mr. Charles Kawenja of KC Auto and their business practices which elicited concerns from the Committee. One issue of note was legal action that Mr. Ryan brought against KC Auto through the Massachusetts Consumer Affairs Bureau. Mr. Kawenja, who attended the 1/10/23 meeting stated he was unaware of the Action against him, and the Committee asked Mr. Kawenja to contact Mr. Ryan for details regarding the suit. The Committee subsequently held the petition on January 10, 2023.

On February 7, 2023, Petition #559-22 was again before the Committee for approval, yet Mr. Kawenja nor any of his representatives were in attendance. The Committee heard an additional first-hand account of KC Auto's business practices from a Ms. Karina Rosado who was in attendance remotely.

Public Comment

KARINA ROSADO, who did not provide an address, outlined her personal interaction with KC Auto.

Ms. Rosado stated that she purchased a vehicle from Facebook Marketplace from KC Auto. Ms. Rosado was told that the vehicle was in good working condition and that the vehicle would pass inspection.

Within a few days of the purchase, Ms. Rosado stated that the vehicle began to feel issues with vehicle as well as audible noises.

Ms. Rosado noted that she had to buy two new tires costing her \$400 and had to get an alignment among other things done for the vehicle.

When trying to contact KC Auto, Ms. Rosado's calls, texts, and emails went unanswered. Ms. Rosado also detailed a complex network of individuals at KC Auto, a certain autobody shop as well as the auto auctions involved in what she referenced as a "scam".

Committee Comments

The Chair went on to detail elements of Mr. Ryan's five-page letter for those who had not had the opportunity to read it. Highpoints of Mr. Ryan's letter included the following:

The Massachusetts Consumer Affairs Bureau found in favor of Mr. Ryan and ordered Mr. Kawenja buy the vehicle back from Mr. Ryan and pay for costs incurred.

Immediately after repurchasing the vehicle back from Mr. Ryan, KC Auto had relisted the vehicle for sale on Facebook Marketplace and in the photos you could now see the state inspection rejection "R" had been stripped away.

Mr. Charles Kawenja, the principal of KC Auto, is additionally operating as Charles Green among at least two other known aliases.

Committee Members asked clarifying questions regarding having a registered repair facility for those applying for and obtaining a Class II Auto Dealers License in the City of Newton. The Chair affirmed that to be true. The Chair also noted that the address of KC Auto is an apartment complex.

Councilor Kelley motioned to deny the petition. The Committee voted in favor of denial 7-0.

#34-23 Request to exceed FAR and to allow parking within five feet of the street at 50 Elmore Street (15:20)

YANMEI LIN petition for SPECIAL PERMIT/SITE PLAN APPROVAL to construct a detached garage structure exceeding FAR and to allow parking within five feet of the street at 50 Elmore Street, Ward 2, Newton Centre, on land known as Section 13 Block 31 Lot 06, containing approximately 7,733 sq. ft. of land in a district zoned SINGLE RESIDENCE 2. Ref: 7.3.3, 7.4, 3.1.3, 3.1.9, 5.1.7.B.2, 5.1.13 of Chapter 30 of the City of Newton Rev Zoning Ord, 2017.

Action: Land Use Held 7-0; Public Hearing Continued

Note: The petitioner, Yanmei Lin, was present to represent the petition. Ms. Lin did not submit a multimedia presentation and deferred to the Planning Department's presentation. Documents pertaining to this petition can be found at the following link:

[50 Elmore St - Petition Documents](#)

Senior Planner Michael Gleba presented the requested relief, criteria for consideration, land use and zoning which can be found at the following link:

[Planning Presentation - 50 Elmore](#)

The petitioner is proposing to construct a 729 square foot 1.5-story detached two-car garage at the rear of the property.

The proposed construction increases the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from .38 to .47 where .42 is the maximum allowed per sections 3.1.3 and 3.1.9, requiring a Special Permit.

Additionally, the petitioner is proposing to construct a new paved driveway for the proposed garage on the western side of the lot. The existing driveway on the eastern side of the lot will be paved and reduced in size to 23.4 feet deep and 9.7 feet wide.

Per section 5.1.7.A, in no case may a parking stall be set back less than five feet from the street. Per section 5.1.7.B.2 requires a minimum stall depth of 19 feet, the proposed parking stall will be within 4.4 feet of the street, requiring a Special Permit per section 5.1.13.

Public Comment

LARRY KLEIN, who did not provide his physical address but stated that he lived across the street from 50 Elmore, noted his opposition to the project.

Mr. Klein cited safety concerns as well as the two driveways and three curb-cuts as the center of his opposition. Mr. Klein continuously called the proposal "excessive" for a single-family home.

Mr. Klein additionally stated that the petitioners have been parking a construction vehicle on the grass.

Committee Comments

Committee Members expressed some concern with the project, most notably agreeing with the Planning Department's assessment that the proposed new driveway be narrowed.

Committee Members also addressed Mr. Klein's statement that there were three curb-cuts when in fact there are only two. One is wider than average and is referenced as a "double curb-cut", but is still a single curb cut. Committee Members also recognized that two curb-cuts for a property this size is superfluous.

Chief Planner Katie Whewell noted that the width of 21.5-foot curb-cut is exceeding what is allowed in the ordinance and the petitioners would need additional relief to keep the curb-cut as it currently is or reduce the width to less than 20 feet.

Committee Members also questioned the petitioner regarding the construction equipment on the grass that was raised by Mr. Klein

Ms. Lin stated that the construction vehicle belonged to her husband and that the garages would be used for residential vehicles and above the garage would be utilized as storage space.

Committee Members repeatedly questioned the petitioner's necessity for a second curb-cut for simply a single-family home. Committee Members recommended narrowing the driveway closer to the street and potentially widening the driveway to the rear of the property where the vehicles would be staged.

Committee Members discussed holding the item to allow time for the petitioner and the Planning Department to work in closer tandem regarding the proposal. The Members asked that the petitioner eliminate one curb-cut and narrow out the second proposed curb-cut.

Councilor Lucas motioned to hold the petition. The motion to hold passed by a voice vote of 7-0. The public hearing for this petition remains open.

#35-23 Request to amend Special Permit #263-20 to further exceed FAR and to amend the approved site plan at 43 Prince Street (37:36)

JOHN AND MARGARET REICHBACH petition for SPECIAL PERMIT/SITE PLAN APPROVAL to amend Special Permit #263-20 to enclose an existing porch and to alter the size and location of a proposed shed at 43 Prince Street, West Newton, Ward 3, on land known as Section 32 Block 10 Lot 06, containing approximately 27,800 sq. ft. of land in a district zoned SINGLE RESIDENCE 1. Ref: 7.3.3, 7.4, 3.1.3, 3.1.9 of Chapter 30 of the City of Newton Rev Zoning Ord, 2017.

Action: Land Use Approved 7-0; Public Hearing Closed 02/07/23

Note: Architect Peter Sachs was present to represent the petitioners. Mr. Sachs did not present a multimedia presentation. Instead, Mr. Sachs referred to the petition documents while orally briefing the proposal. The documents pertaining to this petition can be found at the following link:

[43 Prince St - Petition Documents](#)

The petitioners were granted Special Permit #263-20 to construct a 2.5-story addition totaling 4,532 square feet, creating a total of 9,116 square feet. An amendment to the special permit and associated site plan is requested to allow for the increased size and relocation of a proposed shed and to enclose a screen porch.

The petitioners are proposing to amend the site plan to allow for a 315 square foot shed where the approved shed was 117 square feet. Additionally, the petitioners are seeking to enclose a 256 square foot rear screen porch constructed as part of the recent addition.

The Special Permit granted an FAR of .32 where .26 is the maximum allowed per sections 3.1.3 and 3.1.9. The proposed modifications increase the FAR from the approved from .32 to .35, requiring an amendment to the special permit.

Senior Planner Michael Gleba presented an orientation of the property as well as the proposed plans, and general site information in addition to the requested relief, criteria for consideration, land use, and zoning which can be found at the following link:

[Planning Presentation - 43 Prince St](#)

Public Comment

ROBERT TUCHMAMN, of 38 Prince Street, noted he was speaking on behalf of ten neighbors who could not attend the meeting. Mr. Tuchmann noted that the petitioner's had treated a majority of the neighborhood with disdain for the better part of three years and had been dishonest with the neighborhood that they intended to rebuild the home.

Mr. Tuchmann noted that the petitioner's project had brought increased levels of dust, dirt, noise, damaged streets, cars, trucks, delivery vehicles, drilling rigs, and cement mixers to the usually quiet neighborhood.

PETER REITENBACHER, of 32 Prince Street, noted that he was an abutter to the property and that he was not here to oppose the project as a whole. Mr. Reitenbacher did state that he wanted to make a statement about the lack of respect that the builder has shown to the abutters and the neighborhood.

Mr. Reitenbacher noted that the builder was dishonest about a number of issues surrounding the project including his intentions with the project, the length of the project, the duration of the construction, the noise, disruption and traffic.

Committee Comments

Committee Members looked for clarity regarding the proposed shed. The understanding amongst the Committee was that the shed was approved for one location, but a consistency ruling permitted it to be located at a second location. Additionally, construction had already begun regarding the shed prior to approval.

The Committee asked if the foundation had been poured for the consistency ruling location or for the location that was before the Committee presently. The petitioner's architectural team stated that the foundation was poured for the proposed location currently before the Committee.

The Committee expressed concern that the porch was enclosed and the proposed shed foundation was poured in a location that had not yet been approved.

Members additionally questioned why the size of the shed was requesting an increase of over 2.5x for the same purpose, which is to enclose a generator.

Mr. Sachs stated that he engaged with engineers and that the added room and length is for fan mechanisms that are over the generator to expel exhaust. Mr. Sachs additionally added that the shed's sole purpose is to house the generator.

The Committee noted that according to the plans submitted by the petitioner that the generator only takes up a small portion of the proposed shed.

Councilor Kelley motioned to close the Public Hearing which carried 7-0. Councilor Kelley motioned to approve the petition. Committee Members reviewed the draft findings and conditions as is shown in the attached presentation. The Committee voted in favor of approval 7-0.

#23-23 Request to amend Special Permit #289-18 at 697 Washington Street (1:27:40)
697 WASHINGTON STREET REALTY TRUST petition for SPECIAL PERMIT/SITE PLAN APPROVAL to amend Special Permit #289-18 to update signage and on-site parking at 697 Washington Street, Newton, Ward 2, on land known as Section 23 Block 19 Lot 1B, containing approximately 16,678 sq. ft. of land in a district zoned BUSINESS 2. Ref: 7.3.3, 7.4, 5.2.13.A, 5.2.13.B of Chapter 30 of the City of Newton Rev Zoning Ord, 2017.

Action: Land Use Approved #23-23(1) 7-0
Land Use Approved #23-23(2) 7-0
Land Use Denied #23-23(3) 0-4-3 (Councilors Greenberg, Laredo, Lucas and Markiewicz Opposed) (Councilors Bowman, Kelley, and Lipof Abstained)

Note: Attorney Michael Ross of Prince Lobel Tye, LLP, with offices at 1 International Place, Boston was present to represent the petitioner. Atty. Ross provided an orientation of the property as well as an overview of the petition and business which can be found at the following link:

[Petitioner Presentation - 697 Washington St](#)

The Documents pertaining to the overall petition can be found at the following link:

[697 Washington St - Petition Documents](#)

The petitioner was granted a special permit in 2014 which was amended in 2018 allowing for the uses, parking and signage. The petitioner now seeks to amend the most recent Special Permit #289-18 to update the signage on the property and conditions relative to parking.

Condition #7 of Special Permit #289-18 prohibits employees from parking within the surface parking area or within the adjacent street parking. The petitioner states that there is excess capacity for parking and seeks to remove the prohibition of on-site parking to allow for four employees to use the surface lot.

The petitioner proposes the following signs, all of which have been approved by the UDC and meet the requirements of section 5.2 of the Zoning Ordinance for by-right signs:

- 59.4 square foot wall-mounted principle sign on the Washington Street façade
- 24 square foot wall-mounted secondary sign on the Court Street façade facing the parking area
- 3 square foot "Welcome" directory sign at the gate
- 2.9 square foot directory sign above the garage door indicating free parking
- 1.5 square foot wall-mounted directory sign indicating reserved parking
- 3 square foot wall-mounted directory sign indicating parking
- 2.5 square foot wall-mounted directory sign indicating free parking
- 2.25 square foot free-standing directory sign indicating the entrance

- 1.5 square foot free-standing directory sign indicating parking is for patrons only
- 1.5 square foot free-standing directory sign indicating no loitering
- 1.5 square foot free-standing directory sign with a QR code for ordering from adult use menu
- 1.5 square foot free-standing directory sign with a QR code for ordering from medical use menu
- 1.5 square foot free-standing directory sign indicating no smoking

An additional request by the petitioner is to remove the one-ounce limit allowed for purchase in the previous Special Permit as the Commonwealth of Massachusetts regulates this industry and the state's threshold for purchase is slightly higher.

Senior Planner Cat Kemmet presented an orientation of the property as well as the proposed plans, and general site information in addition to the requested relief, criteria for consideration, land use, and zoning which can be found at the following link:

[Planning Presentation - 697 Washington St](#)

Public Comment

DAVE DEBANY, of 26 Court Street, noted that has no issue with the petition as it pertains to the sign or parking, but did take issue with the landscaping.

Mr. Debany noted that the previous Special Permit for the property was to cover screening and landscaping. However currently the trees on the site are either dead and or dying creating very little screening for abutting properties.

ADAM LUNIN, of 24 Court Street, noted that the Committee was considering amending the Special Permit when the previous permit was not being followed.

Mr. Lunin also stated that trash from the site routinely finds its way into his yard including joint tubes, cigarettes, store receipts etc. Mr. Lunin questioned who the enforcement mechanism of the Special Permit fell to.

Elisabeth Ryan, General Manager of Garden Remedies, stated that unruly employees have had their employment terminated and that Garden Remedies has and will continue to do hourly trash cleanups of the parking lot to prevent the store's trash from entering the neighborhood.

SARAH QUIGLEY, who did not provide an address, took issue with the new signs and described them as "loud" and too large. Noting that the word "cannabis" was capitalized on the signs, while the name of the business was lowercase.

SETH ANAPOLLE, of 88 Central Avenue, noted that he would like to align his comments with previous speakers.

Mr. Anapolle stated that the word cannabis was superfluous as customers will be able to find the property regardless and the fact that the word cannabis appears on property signs is more of an advertisement for the neighborhood and to attract more customers.

Mr. Anapolle asked that the Land Use Committee try and find a balance between the needs of the business as well as the needs of the community.

TERRY SAURO, of 24 Cook Street, noted that the current signs that are on the business were erroneously placed and should be taken down.

Ms. Sauro stated that kids going to Newton North High School as well as going to church have to see these signs and it is an advertisement to a younger generation of Newton residents.

Committee Comments

Committee Members expressed concern about the high-volume of activity in the upper parking lot because people have to back out onto Washington Street, which is not an ideal situation.

Committee Members also spoke on the abundance of parking, which limited the amount of area for vegetation and landscaping.

Committee Members questioned if the bike racks that were instituted as part of the previous Special Permit were being utilized and how employees were currently arriving to work.

Ms. Ryan answered that a majority of the employees are driving or taking ride-shares to work due to seasonal weather and that Garden Remedies expects the bike racks to be utilized more in the warmer months. She also noted that Garden Remedies currently subsidizes ride-shares for employees who need them.

The Committee, through discussion and debated, decided to break the petition into three parts and vote on each part separately rather than on the project as a whole:

Part I: Rectifying the technical error of the SP to bring it in line with state standards.

Part II: Allowing employee parking on site.

Part III: Allowing the current and proposed signage on site.

Councilor motioned to close the Public Hearing which carried 7-0. Councilor Lucas motioned to approve the petition. Committee Members reviewed the draft findings and conditions as is shown in the attached presentation. The Committee voted as follows:

Part I: 7-0 Approved

Part II: 7-0 Approved

Part III: 0-4-3 (Councilors Greenberg, Laredo, Lucas and Markiewicz opposed) (Councilors Bowman, Kelley, and Lipof abstained)

#36-23 Request to amend Special Permit #48-16 to construct four rooftop solar arrays at 255-257 Newtonville Avenue (2:46:29)

CS SDP NEWTONVILLE, LLC petition for SPECIAL PERMIT/SITE PLAN APPROVAL to amend Special Permit #48-16 to construct a rooftop solar facility with four arrays at 255-257 Newtonville Avenue, Newtonville, Ward 2, on land known as Section 12 Block 16 Lot 08, containing approximately 76,000 sq. ft. of land in a district zoned MANUFACTURING.

Action: Land Use Approved 6-0-1 (Councilor Lucas Abstained); Public Hearing Closed 02/07/23

Note: Martin Mija, Director of Engineering for Louth Callan Renewables, was present to represent the petition. Mr. Mija did not present a multimedia presentation and deferred to the Planning Department to present an orientation of the property and site as well as an overview of the project. All documents associated with this petition can be found at the following link.

[255-257 Newtonville Ave - Petition Documents](#)

Senior Planner Michael Gleba presented the requested relief, criteria for consideration, land use and zoning which can be found at the following link:

[Planning Presentation - 255-257 Newtonville Ave](#)

The property located at 255-257 Newtonville Avenue consists of a 76,000 square foot lot improved with a self-storage facility granted under Special Permit 48-16 and constructed in 2016. The parcel is located in the Manufacturing district at the corner of Newtonville Avenue and Lewis Terrace abutting the Mass Pike to the rear.

Special Permit #48-16 was granted in 2016 to construct a 113,000 square-foot self-storage facility. The petitioner proposes to construct four solar arrays on the roof of the structure. The equipment has a minimum setback of four feet from the edge of the roof.

To construct the arrays and modify the approved site plan as proposed requires an amendment to Special Permit #48-16.

The Newton Zoning Ordinance has no specific provisions regulating solar facilities. The State Zoning Act, MGL Chapter 40A, section 3 states that “No zoning ordinance or by-law shall prohibit or unreasonably regulate the installation of solar energy systems or the building of structures that facilitate the collection of solar energy, except where necessary to protect the public health, safety or welfare.”

The proposed solar arrays do not violate any zoning regulations and require no relief or waivers of local zoning beyond the proposed amendment to the special permit.

Public Comment

SEAN ROCHE, of 44 Daniels Street, noted the large size of the lot and asked the petitioner if they were willing to consider supplying electric vehicle (EV) charging stations to service the neighborhood.

Mr. Mija stated he would bring up the request with the project owners but did not expect that to be a part of the Special Permit.

BERNIE HINTEREGGER, of 20 Lewis Terrace, noted that a lot of abutters in the neighborhood have had problems with this property.

Mr. Hinteregger noted that the previous Special Permit called for the protection of 28 mature trees on the property. Currently there are 21 trees on the property according to Mr. Hinteregger.

Mr. Hinteregger also stated that one of these neglected trees on the property had fallen and resulted in over \$8,000.00 of damage to his property. The previous Special Permit called for 22 15-foot evergreens on the property and there are only 12 15-foot evergreens currently on the property according to Mr. Hinteregger.

Committee Comments

Committee Members questioned the Planning Department on whether or not the petitioner had shirked their responsibilities in the previous Special Permit as it pertained to the number of trees on site.

Mr. Gleba noted that the Department would have conducted an inspection of the site when the previous Special Permit was granted and no issues were raised at that time. This indicated that it is likely that weather patterns or some unforeseen action had occurred for the vegetation not to take, but was not an intentional act or negligent act on the part of the petitioner.

Some Committee Members did note that a number of trees had been taken down during the construction process. This did not run contrary to the letter of the Council Order issued, but certainly the spirit of the order that was issued noted some Members.

Councilors not on the Committee additionally addressed the tree issue stating during construction the trees that were promised to be protected were not well protected. Adding that they believe the petitioner tried to make it right and a lot of trees died due to the very warm summer in Massachusetts.

Committee Members discussed adding a condition to the Councilor Order that a landscape plan be approved by the Newton Superintendent of Urban Forestry prior to solar installation.

The Committee agreed this was an appropriate condition to add to the Council Order to ensure that trees and vegetation on the site are the most durable for the area.

Councilor Laredo motioned to close the Public Hearing which carried 7-0. Councilor Laredo motioned to approve the petition. Committee Members reviewed the draft findings and conditions as is shown in the attached presentation. The Committee voted in favor of approval 6-0-1 with Councilor Lucas abstaining.

#33-23 Request to allow a three-story structure with 32 feet in height, an FAR of 1.42 and to waive seven parking stalls at 296 Watertown Street (3:37:09)

YOUNGSUN PARK petition for SPECIAL PERMIT/SITE PLAN APPROVAL to allow a three-story structure with 32 feet in height; to allow an FAR of 1.42 and to reduce the number of required parking stalls at 296 Watertown Street, Ward 1, Newton, on land known as Section 11 Block 14 Lot 02, containing approximately 5,388 sq. ft. of land in a district zoned BUSINESS 1. Ref: 7.3.3, 7.4, 4.1.2.B.3, 4.1.3, 5.1.4, 5.1.13 of Chapter 30 of the City of Newton Rev Zoning Ord, 2017.

Action: Land Use Held 4-3 (Councilors Bowman, Greenberg, and Kelley); Public Hearing Continued

Note: Attorney Terrence Morris, of the Law Office of Terrence Morris, LLC, with offices at 57 Elm Road, Newton, was present to represent the petitioner. Atty, Morris was joined by members of the project development team including Project Manager Myoungkeun Kim.

Atty. Morris did not submit a multimedia presentation but utilized the petition's documents as a reference.

Documents pertaining to this petition can be found at the following link:

[296 Watertown St - Petition Documents](#)

Senior Cat Kemmet presented the requested relief, criteria for consideration, land use and zoning which can be found at the following link:

[Planning Presentation - 296 Watertown St](#)

The petitioner intends to raze the existing single-family dwelling and construct a three-story mixed-use structure with ground level commercial and covered parking and two residential units above.

Per section 4.1.2.B.3 and 4.1.3, a special permit is required to allow for a three-story structure with 32 feet in height.

Per section 4.1.3, the maximum by-right FAR is 1.00 and up to 1.50 by special permit. The building is proposed with a total of 6,667 square feet, resulting in an FAR of 1.25, requiring a special permit.

The petitioner is proposing to construct 1,472 square feet of ground-floor retail space and two residential units above. Per section 5.1.4, a retail use requires one stall per every 300 square feet plus one stall per every three employees at the busiest shift; and a residential use requires two parking stalls per each dwelling unit.

The proposed uses require a total of ten parking stalls, six for the retail space and four for the two residential dwelling units. The petitioner intends to construct three parking stalls in a ground level facility enclosed on three sides. A waiver of seven parking stalls is required per sections 5.1.4 and 5.1.13.

Public Comment

EVANGELOS BALAFAS, of 277 Craft Street, owns the business next door and stated how there is already an issue with parking in the area, especially for his employees.

Mr. Balafas noted that due to the size and scope of this project, parking will increasingly be more difficult for those that work and live in the immediate vicinity of this project.

ALDO (Last Name inaudible), of 286 Watertown Street, also noted how parking was going to be an issue regarding this petition. Mr. Aldo referenced the relief requested and stated how the project is required to have ten parking stalls and is only providing three, which would force patrons of the retail space or residence of the project to search for those additional seven stalls among the neighborhood.

VINCENTE NETO, who did not provide an address, aligned his comments closely with those of the previous speakers as it relates to parking.

TERRY SAURO, of 44 Cook Street, noted the lateness of the hour (11:10pm) and asked that the petition be held due to her concerns and those of the neighborhood.

Ms. Sauro also aligned her comments with previous speakers pertaining to parking. She additionally noted that she had more to say but was exhausted.

LUCY PARK, who did not provide an address, noted she was a business owner in close proximity to the proposed site.

Ms. Park aligned her comments closely to those of the previous speakers as it pertained to the availability of parking on Watertown Street.

Committee Comments

Committee Members had spoken with the petitioner previously and noted that his business generates 1-4 visitors a week, not a day noting this is a very low trafficked business and that there are metered parking on the site.

Committee Members discussed the merits of waiving the seven parking stalls and noted that more examination was necessary particularly what happens if the use of this property or ownership changes.

Councilors not on the Committee asked if this was an appropriate use of the current space. Noting that a nearly 1,500 square foot retail space is only being allotted one parking space and the additional two units are getting one stall each.

Councilor Laredo motioned to hold the petition which carried 4-3. The Public Hearing for this petition remains open.

The Committee adjourned at 11:33 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Richard Lipof, Chair