

The regular meeting of the Bridgewater Planning Board convened at 6:34 pm.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Driscoll, Mr. Ajemian, Ms. Guarino, Mr. Geller and Mr. MacDonald

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS: Ms. Rojas and Ms. Santarcangelo (her first hearing after appointment)

STAFF MEMBERS: Ms. Burke, Director; Ms. Farinacci, Assistant Planner; Ms. Dorr, Office Administrator and Mr. Etoniru, Town Engineer

Mr. Driscoll introduced the new Associate Member Julia Santarcangelo

Mr. Driscoll read from prepared text on Governor Bakers order of 3/12/2020 and how the meeting will be conducted and how to be able to speak at the meeting. He advised the audience that this meeting is being recorded and will be posted within 48 hours on the Town of Bridgewater website or social web page.

60-88 BROAD STREET PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUATION

Police Chief Delmonte spoke in favor of the project. Mr. Ajemian expressed concern with pedestrian safety. Ms. Guarino questioned if the traffic signals can be adjusted after the fact if there is a problem? The Chief explained that there is a loop down at the railroad track that triggers the lights so you cannot take a left from Central Sq. on to Main Street for three cycles in some cases and particularly in the afternoon it is an ever source of frustration for many; central sq. is really something we need to reevaluate and the structure of Broad Street, Summer Street, Main St, South and Bedford streets. This is where the solution lies, he said.

Mr. Clarkson, representing the applicant, spoke about the perspective of the developer that it would be transformational and take a lot of work and compromise. So over the years they have worked with the Town and Town council to collaborate and update an ordinance which envisioned a mixed-use project like this that will transform the central business district and create a viable and walkable downtown where people can live, work and shop. He said that the developer has been willing to compromise along the way to make improvements and changes to the project and is drastically different from what was originally proposed.; he suggested that this demonstrates the developer's flexibility and willingness- the unit count has been reduced significantly, the mitigation that has been proposed has increased significantly to well over a million dollars now. Obviously, when changes made, there has been more costs both in terms of time and financial resources have been born by the developer. He believes that the plan before the board is the best representation of this project. It is also important to note that any further changes, in particular the density and unit count will render the project financially unfeasible. He said the question was asked of him several weeks ago if the for-sale signs on the property were sincere and at that time he answered honestly and said yes; Mr. Paskell is at a point that he needs to consider what his options are to recoup the investment that he has made in the property and the carrying costs that he has had for several years.

Mr. Etoniru was present, but, had another obligation so the floor was given to him for any engineering questions the board may have. Mr. Ajemian said his main question for Mr. Etoniru and Mr. Silva is that Mr. Silva has shown two crosswalks on the plans he submitted several weeks ago but doesn't say anywhere what they will look like; Mr. Etoniru's email stated the following: "Crosswalks should be reduced to a centralized signalized single crosswalk with bump out on both sides in order to minimize potential traffic accidents that could be engendered by several crosswalks within close proximity of each

other. Warning signs for approaching vehicles in both directions alerting them to the existence of a signalized pedestrian crosswalk should be installed. The crosswalk bump out is not very much favored by those responsible for sidewalk snow plowing, but the safety of pedestrians who need a refuge standing place while they wait to use the crosswalk must be held paramount. A raised crosswalk is not advisable, and I wouldn't recommend it because of the potential for ice buildup and stormwater flow impediment/impoundment". Azu commented that his comments were based upon the traffic study that was done and the traffic patterns on Broad Street. When you have too many possibilities for stop and go, he said, it is counter intuitive and could increase the number of accidents that could occur. He said that when you have a centralized crosswalk, with proper in light and advanced notification signs in both directions alerting on coming traffic to the crosswalk that will be more beneficial, Also, if you have a turn off area for a holding pattern for the pedestrians so they can gather for refuge before they walk. He said the crosswalk should be located directly across from the parking on the east side to the curbing on the west side between the two southerly buildings. Mr. Ajemian asked Mr. Etoniru if he thought the bump out was a good or bad idea? Mr. Etoniru said the bump out is what he was calling the island. Mr. Ajemian commented that he had mentioned several meetings ago about not allowing left hand turns or limiting the hours and he asked Mr. Etoniru if he thought there should be some restrictions regarding turns? He said he would make the same comment he made when the Cumberland Farms site plan was being revamped; where you are having too many traffic movements, he would strongly recommend there are restrictions on the turning movements coming out of the project site by eliminating the turn left movement especially during the morning and afternoon peak hours. He indicated that if they were at the design state of this project, he would recommend one driveway interconnecting throughout; however, this restricted movement would achieve the same degree objective of objective he would have been looking for in terms of interconnecting the three parcels.

Mr. Driscoll commented that the sidewalks would have to all be ADA compliant and he would expect that would be outside the mitigation as it would be required anyway. Mr. Etoniru concurred and said that is what was required with the laundromat. He noted that building D had no handicap parking on the plan and asked Mr. Etoniru if one was required? Mr. Etoniru said yes; the parking is not interconnected. Mr. Driscoll asked Mr. Silva if that could be corrected on the plans and not lose a parking space? Mr. Etoniru noted that anyone of those parking spaces could be converted to handicapped. Mr. Silva said they would not lose a spot, just a little bit of green space. Mr. Driscoll mentioned that there were no trees in front of building F and asked Rebecca if that was just an oversight? Rebecca said they would have to refer to the landscaping plans. The landscape plan was brought up on the screen and yes, there are several trees out front.

Ms. Rojas questioned if there was space for trash trucks to park and room to come in and out? Mr. Silva said the location of the dumpsters are on the plan which are straight in and they would be able to unload right from the top.

Mr. Ajemian asked if there was going to be a freight elevator in the buildings? Mr. Paskell said no; they will be wide enough to service both people and produce that needs to be moved. He asked if there are charging stations on the east side and Mr. Paskell said that was their plan. Mr. Ajemian asked about the west side? Mr. Paskell said they are going to attempt that also. Mr. Ajemian asked how will the watering of plantings be taken care of? Mr. Paskell commented that he was not sure; they can't connect to a sprinkler system of any type; obviously, he doesn't want to spend money on all these plantings and have them die. Mr. Silva said they could connect to the Town water supply and install a

spicket for handheld hose. If they wanted irrigation, a well would have to be put in. Mr. Ajemian questioned how large would the trees be behind the buildings on the west side for the purpose of screening? Mr. Driscoll noted that the caliper of the trees is shown on the landscape plan. Mr. Silva said that the arborvitae will be 7-8 feet installed. Mr. Ajemian said he brought up at the last meeting the fact that the solar panels could be seen from the 4th floor and there might be a potential issue of glare on those people. There are windows there and he asked if perhaps they may need railings if people could get out of those windows. Mr. Paskell said they discussed putting the panels on the 4th level, not the 3rd level. Mr. Driscoll noted that the plans do show panels on the 3rd floor. Mr. Paskell said that since they had reduced the level of the 3rd floor down, they would not put solar in that area; only on the 4th floor of two buildings. Mr. Driscoll asked if the walk upstairs will be replaced with a hatch as the building inspector recommended? Mr. Paskell said they are fine with that. Mr. Ajemian questioned the fact that the land seems to be mounded up where building E will be. That was discussed with Mr. Silva. Mr. Paskell noted that because of the grade in Broad Street, the height of each one will be determined by the grade; they will not be the same. 3-4 feet difference with each building; Mr. Ajemian asked if there will be bike racks? Mr. Clarkson said he did not think the specific locations of them were shown on the landscape plan, but the detail and images are clearly delineated. Mr. Ajemian commented that the detail should be on the plan. Mr. Clarkson stated that could be one of the conditions. Mr. Ajemian questioned how the number of shared parking spaces is determined? Mr. Silva commented that we may be a town, but this acts as an urban area...a city type situation. Except for Cumberland Farms, the businesses in this area rely on street parking; if you look at them individually, they do not have enough parking to function, but they do very well. Ms. Burke said there is no formula for determining if the shared parking is enough; the Planning Board should make a judgement based upon the type of development area that its located and the parking provided that the parking is sufficient for the buildings and uses based upon staff and engineering recommendations. She said there is plenty of off-site parking on Stetson St, Hale Street, the parking lot across the street and this project is close enough to the Spring Street parking lot and felt the board should be comfortable in allowing the shared parking.

Mr. Geller asked if the light posts they are submitting for the project will just be in just this area or will they go up to the center of Town? This is for consistency and looks, he said. Rebecca Baptiste said she knows they were planned for on-site and would want to match whatever the town requires within the street. Mr. Geller asked about their snow removal plan? He said it seems like they will be moving the snow from one side of the street to another; will loose about 20 spaces. Mr. Silva said if it becomes problematic and they are losing too many parking spaces, it will have to be removed to another off-site location. Mr. Silva said it would really be a storm-by-storm case. Mx. Guarino suggested they take the fact that there is no parking on Broad Street during a storm and the 20 parking spaces in the parking lot would be very desirable.

Mr. Driscoll wanted to make clear with the development team what the density bonuses are and what we can expect for mitigation before they deliberate.

#1-Either a payment of \$350,000 or acquisition of the property adjacent to the Academy Building; that payment would occur prior to the first occupancy permit. Mr. Paskell said he wasn't sure; have had so many iterations of the developer's agreement. Mr. Driscoll said he is trying to figure the density and asked Mr. Paskell if he would be buying the house and turning it over to the town? Mr. Paskell said because of the length of time that has gone by, the terms of the sellers have changed, so he would probably turn over the money instead. That is four units, plus the commercial space.

#2- A payment from the developer of \$350,000 to be used on the Town Common to restore the war memorial and other things. Mr. Paskell clarified that it was up to \$350,000 to get that done per the architectural drawing. Mr. Driscoll felt that the "up to" was to be taken out so we know exactly what we are voting on; he believes the amount was changed to the amount of \$350,000. Mr. Paskell stated that he was ok with that.

#3- This is the one where there was confusion at the last meeting- references to the payment for the purposes of street scape and references attachment E which is simply photos of a street with trees and stone walls, etc. with no real scope of work and what is going to happen. We need to determine what is shown on your plan what is for the public good. He explained that if this was any other development or subdivision, and there was this much disturbance with sidewalks, curb cuts and utility cuts and tying the lot across the street, in his opinion, what is on his plan is part of the project and the mitigation money would be to further enhance Broad street beyond that. Mr. Clarkson stated that they had a follow up about that with Ms. Burke and Mr. Dutton and what he would suggest is the reality is combination of what you are suggesting and what they had discussed with the town. He said Mr. Driscoll was correct that under a normal project there may be some restoration and things would be fixed. But what we are talking about here is enhancements, so things like bump outs and the flashing lights we heard about. He said his conclusion was that there was a consensus that the \$350,000 is really for enhancements to that area that would not occur and other impacts of the project in the area. He believes that when the time comes, they will be directed by the town to make improvements that they think are necessary as part of this project. He said that those improvements made by the developer would cost less than what the town could do them for and the value actually exceeds the \$350,000. Mr. Driscoll stated that what is on the plan is something the board would ask for anyway to make a safe environment for the project. With a project like this, you would have to make the sidewalks ADA compliant, water and gas lines coming thru there that need to be repaired, the curb cuts are necessary, and the bump outs and crosswalks are to connect the parking lot with the project. He stated that it is clean if they do the work, and the town gets the check for \$350,000. Then the town can hire who they want to expand on this project. That is where we get to the benefit of the whole town and public at large, he said, and not just for the project. Mr. Paskell said that what would typically occur is if they are connecting water, they might open a 4' wide gap in the sidewalk out to the street. In this case, they have suggested that they would replace the sidewalk which is a benefit to the town. He thinks there is some crossover and should probably be further discussed. Mr. Driscoll stated that the impact that is here needs a tremendous amount of work to be done and he would think it would be within the board's purview to condition it that the sidewalks need to be completely redone in front of the project. If we are looking for six units for that benefit it would be easy to weigh if we are getting a check benefit for the town so they can expand upon the work that they will be doing. Mr. Ajemian concurred with Mr. Driscoll, and he feels that he has been consistent since the first meeting that this Board is not confined by the developer's agreement and have to follow it. He was not part of that; it was something outside the purview of the Planning Board, but we are, by law, the entity that approves project like this and it bothers him that that agreement is used as a reason to go a particular way. Mr. Clarkson stated that the Developer's agreement is required in the Ordinance and has been negotiated between the developer and the Town, they have relied on it as a guide the way they would proceed with the project but recognize fully the authority of the Planning Board to ultimately make the final decision.

Mr. Driscoll brought up the solar energy reference of 6 additional units for it. He referred to Section 19.04 stating that we can only allow one unit on a building that has a solar roof. So, in order to comply with zoning, we could only allow 2 units in that category. He said he had pointed this out several times, and it is still 6. Mr. Clarkson said that when they negotiated this during the developer's agreement with the town manager, there were additional placements of solar panels and as the project has progressed, there have been some adjustments as we have seen here tonight. They would be agreeable to discussions about additional solar panels to get that density bonus back. Mr. Driscoll felt there were other ways around it, but they do have to following zoning regulations He just wanted it clear that it is two buildings, 4th floor and only 2 units are allowed. Ms. Burke said that it is one unit for each building that has solar panels.

Mr. Driscoll noted that the walkup staircase was ok with the developer; Mr. Paskell said it would be a hatch access, by ladder. He listed several other things that had been discussed such as rooms designated as dining room have a 5' clear opening. Mr. Paskell said that was fine; that is all. It is a normal door height.

Mr. Geller asked what their plans were for signage for the commercial? Mr. Paskell commented that he feels it is important to have a consistent look throughout the buildings and whatever they do for one, will do for the others. He assured the board that you won't see neon, flashing lights, or florescent. They will be something a small town would like for presentation.

Mr. Driscoll reviewed the Transfer of Development Rights. The deed restriction would prohibit any further development other than for parking and open space, in perpetuity; the developer will grant the town an easement for the purpose of parking and open space, in perpetuity and will incorporate a mechanism into the deed that should the property be abandoned for a period of 12 months or more, the town could obtain it for \$1.00; the parking lot will be built according to the approved plan and maintained in perpetuity. The owners of D, E, and F will have the deed restrictions reviewed and approved by the Town Attorney prior to recording subject to any partial releases to be obtained by the applicant. He asked Mr. Paskell if that was all agreed upon? Mr. Paskell said yes; he felt it was important for the board to know that it is almost another level of mitigation because, initially that parking lot was thought to just be necessary to resurface it and that there were recent drainage situations that were confirmed as being acceptable. Now we determine that it is not and will probably be a multi thousand-dollar proposition to put that into the condition that the town now needs. That is something that they will be paying for and a benefit to the town. He felt it was another mitigation value that he is supporting and will have no future development rights to that property. Mr. Driscoll noted that it was part of the overall project and needed for the project.

It was noted that the board has received 5 letters/emails since the last hearing: Mr. Gotshalk, Mr. Candito, Mr. Colombotos and Mrs. Hanson. The Board members have copies of them. Mrs. Hanson and Mr. Colombotos had requested that their letters be read into the record. Mr. Ajemian read 3/21/ and 3/22 from Mrs. Hanson and the one from Mr. Colombotos.

Carlton Hunt- Austin Street-hoped that the Planning Board could close the hearing tonight and get into the conditions. He suggested that the Planning Board has been very accommodating to the developer seeing as 7 years ago a plan was provided and withdrawn and we only recently got the final set of plans. He commented that the basic 38 units on the site, now moved to 67 from an unfortunate ZBA decision

that has significant ramifications down the road. He felt that we have set precedence now for another developer to claim the same thing that these are contiguous lots when they are not. He said he could live with around 58-61 units. He agreed with the wide opening in the dining room to ensure that it isn't a bedroom use. He thought there should be only one point of access and egress across from Hale Street. He totally supports the single crosswalk location. He said he had a possible solution to the solar issue; he stated that a recent study came out and said the preferred place in Massachusetts right now for solarizing is already developed ground, i.e. buildings, parking lots, etc.

Nick Palermo- the owner of the Greyhound Tavern supported the project.

Nick Palmieri- 36 Dartmouth Road-supported the project.

No one else wished to speak at this time.

Mr. Driscoll wanted to go back to the mitigation money issue, especially with the \$350,000 for the war memorial on the common. He thought the agreement was that Mr. Paskell would cut a check for the \$350,00 and the town would do the work. Ms. Burke said she thought the agreement was between Mr. Dutton and Mr. Paskell was that he would do the work because he could do it for less money than the town could do the work and he agreed to provide a check for the additional amount if it turns out to be less than \$350,000. Mr. Clarkson agreed and stated that the board, in their condition, could say that the work will be done by the developer as directed by the Town up to \$350,000. If the town wants to increase the scope of work done and have Mr. Paskell do it, then condition should be worded accordingly. Mr. Driscoll stated that he would rather just have Mr. Paskell cut a check so it is cleaner. Mr. Paskell stated that the agreement was just as Ms. Burke outlined. Mr. Driscoll questioned what difference would it make as the amount would be the same? Mr. Paskell said it is just the way he agreed to do it. If that is what you want, then it is up to the board to determine, he said.

Mr. Driscoll said he is hung up on the street scape plan..... What is shown on the plan, he would want as part of the project. He asked Mr. Paskell if he is willing to do what is on the site plan and landscape plan and do the \$350,00? Mr. Paskell felt there was some crossover as to what was mitigation and what was going to be required by the project. Connecting water would allow him to dig a trench four feet wide and he could put that block back and it would be returning the street and the sidewalk to its original condition. Mr. Driscoll said that it is not just the trenches; it is the curbing and curb cuts, the ADA access, the bump outs...all the things you need to do to achieve your project and personally, he felt the \$350,00 was needed in addition to that work. Mr. Clarkson stated that there is some grey area here and asked if they could condition as discussed and allow discretion for the Town Engineer and Town Manager to determine what is essential for the project. . Mr. Driscoll said personally he would want to know what he was voting on and not leaving it up to discretion. Mr. MacDonald asked Mr. Paskell if he was willing to do what Mr. Driscoll is suggesting...do what is on the plan and give the \$350,000? Mr. Paskell said no; he felt there was much on the plan that speaks to mitigation, and he is happy to do it. He suggested that there is clarification involved.

Mr. Ajemian suggested closing the hearing and deliberate further at the next meeting. Mr. Driscoll said he would like to get somewhere with this tonight; there are a lot of concerns from the public, concerns on the board and he is trying to get where we need to get, or can we get a compromise tonight? He said he would be willing to give up the \$350,000 to get the streetscape and have them do what is on the plan and reduce the project by 6 units; he would be comfortable with that.

Mr. Ajemian said his feeling is that any mitigation money should be thrown into the development. He would like to see the reduction of units because, from his perspective, if there is any problem, it is too large and by reducing it even by a few units, it may help with some of the potential issues of parking, crossing the street, safety and things like that. He is very much in favor of this project, but any mitigation money that could be put into it, would be great.

Mr. MacDonald stated that he is not speaking for Mr. Paskell, but he has been pretty straight forward about not being amenable to a reduction in units; he stated that he believes we will be wasting Mr. Paskell's time if we make that condition. Mr. Geller asked, "what if we reduce it to \$250,000 and he does everything on the plan?" Mr. Driscoll stated that he felt what is shown on the plan should be done as it is all connected. He again suggested taking away the \$350,000. Mr. Hunt made a suggestion that one potential solution that has town benefit could be for the developer to solarize the parking lot and allow charging from the public free of charge; that makes that TDR even stronger, he said.

Ms. Guarino agreed with Mr. Driscoll that the work shown on the plans needs to be done by the developer as part of the project.

Mr. Paskell stated that he is not opposed to Steve's recommendation; he would have further discussion on that; he doesn't know what the breakout at this moment, so he can't give an absolute breaking amount, but he is okay with making a concession that he feels is somewhat reasonable. Mr. Driscoll asked if we said keep the \$350,000 would you be willing to give up credits for that \$350,000 if we gave you everything else to go to 61? Mr. Paskell said he would not want to do that.

Mr. MacDonald said that most of the businesses in that area use street parking and he believes this project relies on much of that street parking, more than their share, at the detriment of existing businesses and residents. He feels that this is a problem that will only get worse if upon approval of this project, other projects follow in the precedence set with this one. He said that Mr. Clarkson stated that this will be the gateway to the town; he felt this was a very insightful and true statement. The question is where is it a gateway to? His issue with this project has been and remains fundamental; the project is too dense for the area and has been expressed by many of the residents. If approved, this project will set a tone and precedence for future development of the downtown; a precedence that he feels will be harmful. In the short term, yes, this will be an economic benefit, but we are a town and community, not simply an economy, he said. Mr. Paskell brought up the fact that the 40B project on Burrill Ave has 52 or 58 units so he finds it hard to believe he gets pushed back on unit counts when in a different scenario this would support more units that he is proposing. He believes they have worked diligently with Ms. Burke and Mr. Dutton to find a common ground. He questioned what precedence would occur if this doesn't go forward. It will continue to look like it is and be what it is and nothing will occur there to the detriment of the existing businesses and any future businesses and developments. He feels this is a good mix for both. Although it is not perfect, it is a work in progress for what both the Town wants, and his development team wants.

Mr. Driscoll stated that he wants to get this to the finish line. He said that this west side site, if we didn't have any ZBA latitude, to go up to 67 units would only house about 52 units under the maximum. He asked Mr. Paskell if we could wipe out some of the mitigation and get him 60 units, would that be something he could work with? Mr. Paskell stated that he doesn't think that works. He said they tried very hard to make it in the 70's. It started in the 80's, then 70's and now it is in the 60's. Mr. Driscoll stated that those numbers didn't comply with zoning anyway. Mr. Paskell said from a financial

standpoint, to build these size buildings, with some of the requirements that are due, it is a push already, especially with the commercial on the first floor. Mr. Driscoll again suggested taking away the \$350,00 payment and Mr. Paskell getting 61 unit; he said that the board has worked with him on the common and the house. Mr. Paskell stated if it is thought that the parking lot was so inconsequential, remove it from the discussion and reduce to a number that we can all live with that would be discussion that he would consider as well, but doesn't know if that works in the overall scope on the board's end. Mr. MacDonald explained that the reason he felt the parking lot was inconsequential was because he felt it was going to be mainly used by the residents and patrons of the businesses. Removing that existence wouldn't fix the issue as they would just go somewhere else and further complicate the issue. He said it does have value, but, to the project, not the town.

Mr. Etoniru said he was back for a minute and then he will be leaving for the rest of the evening, but he had a couple of comments. He said that what you are doing, technically involves a special permit, so the idea of setting a precedence, in his opinion, is used rather loosely. When dealing with special permit applications, it is not setting a precedent because the decision you are making is unique to the project and the decision made here, doesn't necessarily relate to another project that may come down the pike. He spoke about adding economic value to the town and making this area look good. He said this project will add value to the town and surrounding businesses and properties. Ms. Farinacci stated that the board should take under consideration that this project is in line with the Massachusetts initiatives for shared parking, reducing our carbon footprint, and making cities more walkable.

Mr. Colombotos-disagreed with Mr. Etoniru's assertion that this won't set a precedence as this is the first project that has come before us under the new mixed-use bylaw and will really set the tone for what applicants may be expecting from this zoning mechanism. They are really extracting the maximum density that they can, and other applicants may look towards the Board to grant liberal densities as well. He commented that he thinks we need to get this right because we will be living with the consequences for years and suggested that the Board take their time to negotiate a better deal.

Mr. Ajemian commented that unless there are any new comments from residences or board members, he suggested closing the hearing and deliberating at the next meeting. Mr. Paskell said he would be willing to sit here until midnight and is willing to accommodate anybody who needs that time to try and get this done.

Ms. Burke suggested that there are other things on the agenda and suggested a pause in this discussion.

On a motion by Mr. MacDonald, seconded by Mr. Geller, it was unanimously voted by roll call vote to recess this discussion and come back later after the other agenda items are taken care of.

675 AUBURN STREET- FORM A PLAN – Pillar Solar

Plan was prepared by Klim Land surveying, Inc. for Pillar, LLC. Ms. Burke explained that the proposed solar farm was denied by the Planning Board and is the subject of litigation. Mr. Luke Klim explained that the purpose of this plan is to subdivide the 112 acres into 4 buildable lots and 2 parcels. Lot 1 will house the existing dwelling. Lots 2 and 3 will have frontage along Auburn Street and Lot 4 is not buildable until a special permit is sought and granted. Parcel A will likely come back before the Board for a possible 3- 4 lot subdivision and Parcel B consisting of 60 acres to be donated to the Wildland Trust.

On a motion by Mr. MacDonald, seconded by Ms. Guarino, it was unanimously voted, by roll call vote, to endorse the plan.

MODIFICATION OF THE FLEX BUILDING ON FRUIT STREET- CLAREMONT CORP.

Attorney Brennan was present representing Claremont. He said the project was approved in November. As a result of certain market information they received from potential occupants, they have made the building a bit shorter and a bit wider. In the course of doing that, they have reduced the size of the building by 3,00 sq.ft. They have reduced the number of parking spaces and have pulled the building further away from the building in the southwest corner. They have decreased the amount of impervious area and increased the open space. Overall the impact of this building has decreased from what was previously approved by the board. He said they presented this to the board as a minor modification. The drainage continues to comply with all the requirements and meets all the groundwater requirements. A drainage report was submitted if needed. The plan continued to comply with all zoning. Everything else remains the same. Ms. Burke stated that her staff has looked at the plan and they don't have any issues. Ms. Farinacci said she spoke with Mr. Etoniru who reviewed it also and he felt there was no problem with the drainage, and he would consider it as a minor modification. Mr. Driscoll asked if there were any changes to the drainage? Mr. Brennan said it was reconfigured a bit, but the capacity hasn't changed. It is in the same area. It is located in the southeast corner of the property; was pulled further away from the wetlands.

On a motion by Mr. MacDonald, seconded by Mr. Ajemian, it was unanimously voted by roll call vote, to deem this submission as a minor modification.

On a motion by Mr. MacDonald, seconded by Mr. Ajemian, it was unanimously voted by roll call vote to approve the minor modifications.

OLDFIELD ESTATES, II MODIFCATION AND MINUTES

There was supposed to be a public hearing tonight on this matter, however, there was an advertising error made by the applicant's representative, so it will not be going forward this evening. (it was advertised in the newspaper; however the abutters were not notified) The hearing is now scheduled for April 21, 2021. The minutes of 3/17 put on the next agenda.

The hearing on the Broad Street project was reconvened at 9:16 pm on a motion by Mr. MacDonald, seconded by Ms. Guarino.

During the recess, an email was sent to the chairman from Counselor Wood in support of the project.

Ms. Burke read it into the record.

Mr. Wood was present; he made comments about shared parking and adapting and working on a project where there is lots of unused parking spaces that may solve some problems.

Mr. James Candito- Stetson Street- felt safety was still an issue and traffic is a major issue.

On a motion by Mr. Ajemian, seconded by Ms. Guarino, it was unanimously voted by roll call vote to continue these deliberations at a special meeting on 4/14 at 5:00 and take a vote.

On a motion by Mr. Ajemian, seconded by Mr. MacDonald, the meeting was adjourned at 9:47 pm.