

**MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE
PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF WORCESTER**

May 2, 2012

WORCESTER CITY HALL – LEVI LINCOLN ROOM

Planning Board Members Present: Anne O’Connor, Chair
Andrew Truman, Vice Chair
Stephen Rolle, Clerk
Satya Mitra, Member

Staff Present: Joel Fontane, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services
Lara Bold, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services
Nancy Tran, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services
Kathleen Donovan, Department of Inspectional Services
K. Russell Adams, Department of Public Works & Parks
Michael Traynor, Law Department

BOARD SITE VISITS

REGULAR MEETING (5:30 PM)

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Anne O’Connor called the meeting to order at 6:01 P.M.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Mitra, the Planning Board voted 4-0 to approve the April 11, 2012 meeting minutes.

**REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCES, EXTENSIONS OF TIME, POSTPONEMENTS,
WITHDRAWALS**

Ms. Bold said the application for 103 Armory Street, 104 Armory Street and 3 Burns Court was continued from the April 11, 2012 meeting. Since the previous meeting, the applicant had decided to decrease the number of proposed dwelling units from ten to four. She explained that the reduced project scope falls below the site plan review threshold and recommended approval of the applicant’s Leave to Withdraw request.

Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Mitra, the Board voted 4-0 to approve the applicant’s Leave to Withdraw request for the Definitive Site Plan (PB-2012-012)

Unfinished Business

1. 266 Chandler Street – Amendment to a Parking Plan (PB-2012-011)

Attorney John Shea from the Law Office of Lian, Zarrow, Eynon & Shea represented the petitioner, Webster Five Cents Savings Bank. Other representatives present with Mr. Shea included Brian Perry (Vice-President of Investments and Facilities, Webster Five Cents Savings Bank) and Jeff Howland (Engineer, J & H Engineering).

Mr. Shea explained that the Zoning Board granted Special Permits in 2010 for two drive-thru banking lanes, in 2011 for the additional third lane and most recently another amendment on April 23, 2012 to allow a bank/credit union with a drive-through and to modify parking layout and dimensional requirements with respect to drive-through length and escape lane requirements. He added that the Planning Board approved a Parking Plan in 2011 for the construction of sixteen parking spaces, two drive-thru lanes and one escape lane.

Mr. Shea said the applicant seeks to amend the previously approved Parking Plan and proposes to increase the existing parking area by providing an additional 10-space employee-only parking area for a total of 29 off-street parking spaces on the southern portion of the site next to Abbott Street on property located at 266 Chandler Street. He said the Zoning Board approved two waivers: (1) from providing a 5' landscape buffer between the employee lot and an abutting single-family dwelling because of the residents' request; and (2) from installing landscaping along Abbott Street because a 15' retaining wall and four DPW jersey barriers separate the bank from vacant land. The latter was approved with the condition that landscaping be provided should the vacant land be later developed.

Mr. Adams from DPW and Ms. Donovan from Inspectional Services had no comments.

Ms. Bold said DPRS recommended approval of the Amendment to Parking Plan dated March 8, 2012.

Upon a motion by Mr. Truman and seconded by Mr. Mitra, the Board voted 4-0 to approve the Amendment to Parking Plan, no revisions to the March 8, 2012 dated plan are required.

Standard Conditions of Approval

- All work must conform to the standards contained in the City of Worcester, Department of Public Works & Parks, Engineering Division, Construction Management Section, STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS & DETAILS, most recent edition.
- The appropriate soil erosion and sediment control measures, including hay bales and silt fences, shall be installed and maintained throughout construction by the applicant to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Inspectional Services.
- All work shall be done in accordance with the final approved Definitive Site Plan on file with the Division of Planning and Regulatory Services.

List of Exhibits.

- Exhibit A: 266 Chandler Street Application; received March 7, 2012; prepared by Webster Five Cents Savings Bank.
- Exhibit B: Parking Plan Amendment; dated March 8, 2012; prepared by B&R Survey Inc.
- Exhibit C: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Division of Planning & Regulatory Services to the Planning Board; re: 266 Chandler Street - Amendment to Parking Plan; dated April 6, 2012.
- Exhibit D: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Department of Public Works & Parks to the Planning Board; re: 266 CHANDLER STREET - Parking Plan Amendment– PB-2012- 011; dated April 6, 2012.

2. 38 Hermon Street – Parking Plan Approval (PB-2012-015)

Jose Martinez from VIACAD, representative for Richard Rizzo, explained that the petitioner proposes to provide 26 parking spaces at 38 Hermon Street. The parcel is partially used for motor vehicle sales and service/repair and has two buildings on site (one is vacant). He added that Zoning Board granted Special Permit on April 23, 2012 to allow retail sales and professional office in addition to existing uses.

Mr. Adams from DPW and Ms. Donovan from Inspectional Services had no comments.

Ms. Bold said DPRS recommended approval of the Definitive Site Plan and that 8 copies of revised plans address the following annotation issues:

1. Show location of any proposed signs for retail business
2. DPRS recommends concrete curbs and revising the notation on the plan that states: asphalt or concrete.
3. Label fences, their height and materials (existing and proposed).
4. Label landscaped areas.
 - Show additional landscaping per the Zoning Board of Appeals' conditions of approval.
 - Remove the note that indicates that 10 trees are required on site. The calculation provided in the note is for interior parking spaces which this lot does not have.
5. Label location, dimensions, number and construction materials of all vehicular and pedestrian circulation elements, including streets and roadways, driveways, entrances, curbs, curb cuts, parking spaces, loading spaces, access aisles, sidewalks, walkways and pathways.
 - Provide a van accessible handicap space by providing an 8' access aisle.
6. Label methods and location of erosion and sedimentation control devices for controlling erosion and sedimentation during the construction process as well as after.
7. Label the approval date, conditions of approval and relief granted from the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. Martinez said he received staff comments, was amenable to the changes and would prepare necessary materials for retail sign approval. However, he said only interior building work would be performed. Ms. Bold replied that comment #6 can be removed since it is only applicable to proposed construction.

Mr. Rolle asked about the parking spaces note. Ms. Bold said one handicap space is required for parking lots with 1-15 spaces. She added that for every 1-8 handicap spaces, the handicap parking must be van accessible. Therefore, the applicant must change the lot striping for such spaces from 5' to 8' in the newly proposed parking area facing Charlton Street.

Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Mitra, the Board voted 4-0 to approve the Parking Plan with the condition that eight (8) copies of revised plans be submitted addressing DPRS comments #1-5 and 7 listed above.

Standard Conditions of Approval

- a. All work must conform to the standards contained in the City of Worcester, Department of Public Works & Parks, Engineering Division, Construction Management Section, STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS & DETAILS, most recent edition.
- b. The appropriate soil erosion and sediment control measures, including hay bales and silt fences, shall be installed and maintained throughout construction by the applicant to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Inspectional Services.
- c. All work shall be done in accordance with the final approved Definitive Site Plan on file with the Division of Planning and Regulatory Services.

List of Exhibits.

- Exhibit A: Parking Plan Application – 38 Hermon Street, received March 22, 2012, prepared by VIACAD.
- Exhibit B: Parking Plan – 38 Hermon Street, received March 22, 2012, dated March 20, 2012, prepared by Marcos Devers.
- Exhibit C: DPRS Memorandum to the Worcester Planning Board, re: 38 Hermon Street, dated April 30, 2012.
- Exhibit D: DPW Memorandum to the Worcester Planning Board, re: 38 Hermon Street, dated April 30, 2012.

3. 25 Queen Street, 1, 4 and 5 Dudley Place – Definitive Site Plan Approval (PB-2012-016)

Attorney Robert Longden from the Law Firm of Bowditch & Dewey represented the applicant, South Middlesex Opportunity Council. The applicant seeks Definitive Site Plan Approval to construct a ~13,168 SF assessment center for homeless adults to be constructed on four parcels located between Jaques Avenue and Davis Street with main vehicular and pedestrian access provided off of Queen St. The site will provide 20 off-street parking spaces. Other representatives with Mr. Longden included:

- Michael Comiskey – Director of Development, South Middlesex Opportunity Council (SMOC)
- Anthony Cleaves – Project Engineer, Whitman & Bingham
- Katherine Garrahan– Attorney, Law Firm of Bowditch & Dewey

The development project will be located on an approximately 1.14 acre site with slopes exceeding 15%. It will serve as a facility to provide transitional housing, comprehensive needs assessment and the initiation of educational and supportive services for up to 40 episodically or chronically homeless individuals. He

reported that the City Building Commissioner, in a letter dated April 5, 2012 (Exhibit E), determined that the proposed facility will have an education use and thus, qualifies for Dover Amendment protection under state law and city ordinance.

Mr. Longden indicated that SMOC has held six neighborhood meetings to discuss and modify site design. He then described how the project will improve site appearance, stabilize slope soil, mitigate stormwater runoff and increase security around the site. The applicant will provide required fire lanes, various snow storage areas, a fenced dumpster and landscaping. Vehicle trips to and from the site are estimated to be no more than 30-40 trips per day. The site has a number of nonconformities with respect to: side and rear-yard setbacks, overhead roof setback, landscape buffer, lack of loading space for a building >10,000 SF. In a letter dated May 1, 2012 (Exhibit J), the Building Commissioner determined that noncompliance with those zoning requirements were reasonable and zoning relief was not required given various the site constraints and the Dover protected use. Both the Fire Department and DPW had no comments regarding the project.

Mr. Longden addressed DPRS comments from a memorandum dated April 30, 2012. He said the applicant is amenable to increasing the number of security cameras (currently six is proposed) to provide entire site coverage. The applicant has agreed to enhance site lighting and clearly annotate its depictions on the site plan. The building rendering will also be revised to reflect accurate locations of lighting as shown on the site plan. He then addressed staff's question regarding lighting in the patio area and said that it will provide a lower level of lighting than the rest of the site. Lighting will not be on the retaining wall along Dudley Place; instead, two light poles will be installed 10-15' from the wall and create minimal spillover onto adjacent properties. A fence will also be installed to prevent people driving to and from the site using Dudley Place. Mr. Longden said the proposed retaining wall will be concrete block; however, the walls cannot be terraced to provide planting because it would encroach onto Dudley Place (Exhibit K). He also stated that an abutting property owner may submit a petition to City Council to remove Dudley Place (private street) from the official map to secure the area. The applicant will support the petition.

Mr. Adams from DPW had no comments.

Ms. Donovan for Inspectional Services reiterated the Building Commissioner's determination that the facility use is protected by the Dover Amendment and that the noncompliant aspects of the site are reasonable considering site constraints.

Mr. Fontane said DPRS recommended approval with the condition that six revised plans address staff comments. He read to the Board an email from Attorney Jonathan Finkelstein on behalf of Mike Ushkurnis, owner of 37 and 47 Jaques Avenue (Exhibit L). The email listed Mr. Ushkurnis' concerns regarding: fencing the end of Dudley Place, removal of Dudley Place from the official map, wall and fencing facing 37 Jaques Avenue, and landscaping and fencing the area along Jaques Avenue to prevent people from wandering in.

Chair O'Connor clarified with Mr. Traynor from the Law Department that a non-profit educational facility is allowed by-right in an RG-5 zone. In this case, the Dover Amendment does not require the applicant to strictly comply to dimensional requirements as long as the nonconformities are of a reasonable standard. Mr. Traynor confirmed this and added that the Building Commissioner's determination can only be overruled by the Zoning Board of Appeals.

William Breault, Worcester resident, expressed his support of the site plan. He said the plan addresses the key element of safety and believes that the project is good for Main South and the City of Worcester.

Franklin Zitmoresky, abutter, had additional comments regarding the site plan. He said 20 parking spaces seemed excessive since staff only requires 5 spaces and suggested eliminating some parking to provide a buffer and front building approach from Queen Street. Mr. Zitmoresky expressed concern over the counterintuitive building approach, specifically the lack of a front façade upon entering from Queen Street and how that may negatively impact future re-use of the building and site. He also brought up issues regarding buffers and screening.

Mike Ushkurnis expressed his concerns regarding fencing, drainage and the potential for trouble at the end of Dudley Place in the alley way.

Chair O'Connor clarified that the removal of Dudley Place from the official map was not currently before the Board. Mr. Longden said snow and rain would be directed to city storm drains and that the applicant was will to replace fencing that is disrepair along Jaques Avenue.

Jo Hart, Main South resident, expressed her dissatisfaction with the site plan and believed that the lot is unbuildable. She suggested that the entire site be a garden instead of the proposed educational facility.

Chair O'Connor asked about the site entrance. Mr. Cleaves said the main access to the facility faces Dudley Place but has emergency exits on the building's northern and western sides.

Mr. Rolle asked about the sidewalk width from the parking lot to the main entrance and whether the applicant has considered rotating the building. Mr. Cleaves said the main sidewalk is 5' wide, that the retaining wall has a 6' fence installed on top and that repositioning the fixed building footprint is not possible given the proposed use and operation of the building. He said the program dictates building, footprint, entrance and security design.

Chair O'Connor asked whether the abandonment of Dudley Place would provide better access to the main entrance. Mr. Rolle said the street removal might allow for sidewalk widening and provide a better viewpoint of the building's main entrance. He then asked the grade from Queen Street. Mr. Cleaves said it was at 5% grade.

Chair O'Connor asked about the number of parking spaces. Mr. Cleaves said the applicant initially proposed 30 spaces, however, reduced it to the minimum required for the building size.

Mr. Rolle asked Mr. Cleaves to summarize the proposed fencing. Mr. Cleaves said the property's perimeter has existing fencing and retaining walls except at the Queen Street entrance and northwest end of the driveway. Mr. Cleaves said fencing running through the site southwestern end will be removed and a new fence will be placed on the property's border along Dudley Place. He also stated that a fence by Jaques Avenue will be repaired and fencing will be mounted on top of the ReCon rock retaining walls.

Chair O'Connor asked about the request for screening around the smoking area. Mr. Cleaves said the smoking area will be located 8' below grade in the building's rear and screened by an internal building wall.

Ms. Hart suggested that SMOC buy the abutting property and move the building over to alleviate most issues discussed at the present Board meeting.

Mr. Zitmoresky believed that if and when Dudley Place is removed from the official map, it will allow the front entrance to move and provide a greater walkway to the building's front entrance.

Mr. Mitra expressed his concern with the site plan and whether the applicant addressed suggestions made at neighborhood meetings. Mr. Longden said many requests were agreed to but not all were incorporated in the site plan. Mr. Comiskey said the building layout was designed based on program needs.

Mr. Mitra asked if it were possible to have the building entrance closer to parking to provide better access to emergency vehicles. Mr. Comiskey said alternatives were considered, however, the proposed layout was the best option.

Mr. Mitra asked about the required parking spaces. Mr. Longden said 20 spaces were required based on the building size. Mr. Zitmoresky clarified his earlier comment and suggested that the applicant request a variance from the Zoning Board to reduce the spaces required on site to comply with setback requirements.

Mr. Longden said the purpose of facility is to replace the People in Peril (PIP) shelter to assist chronically and episodically homeless individuals. He added that bed facilities would be available until the individuals are assessed and placed in stable housing. Twenty parking spaces are available for staff, caregivers and those bringing homeless to the facility.

Mr. Fontane said the abandonment of Dudley Place would not require the applicant to return before the Board. However, the applicant would have to apply for a Definitive Site Plan amendment should it decide to propose changes to its site plan. He stated that the present site design has incorporated neighborhood desires such as use of Queen Street as the site's entrance. He added that the project is a high priority of City administration and requires approval in order to open in November without a contingency on the removal of Dudley Place.

Mr. Mitra asked what the distance between the parking lot and building's main entrance is. Mr. Longden said the distance was approximately 70'. Mr. Mitra asked the overall project cost. Mr. Longden replied that it was \$2.5-3 million.

Mr. Rolle asked how people would travel to/from the facility. Mr. Comiskey said people would generally arrive by foot or by bus. Mr. Rolle expressed his concern regarding the sidewalk width from Queen Street to the building. He suggested that it be widened to 5' to accommodate wheelchairs and pedestrians. He also recommended that the applicant consider widening the sidewalk to 6' from the parking lot to building's main entrance.

Mr. Truman asked the slope at the entrance. Mr. Cleaves said the slope was below 5%.

Mr. Finkelstein reiterated concerns of his client, Mr. Ushkurnis, regarding fencing, drainage and landscaping. Mr. Cleaves said the applicant was amenable to providing new black vinyl-coated chain link fencing or different decorative fence along Mr. Ushkurnis' property. Mr. Cleaves said street trees and bushes shown on the landscaping plan would be installed. The parking lot would be connected to a drainage system with an overflow outlet and that runoff would be routed to an underground stormwater system with pipe overflow.

Mr. Rolle asked for clarification regarding decorative fencing. Mr. Finkelstein said the fencing was along Jaques Avenue. Mr. Rolle said he was more supportive of providing fencing of higher quality along the street.

Mr. Rolle asked if the applicant considered providing fencing along the parking lot's steep slope. Mr. Cleaves said the area was a steep, would be difficult to access and that the fence would prohibit snow storage.

Mr. Finkelstein asked why fencing was required on top of a retaining wall. Mr. Fontane said the fencing was for safety purposes. Mr. Cleaves said the wall along Dudley place is an at-grade retaining wall and that the fencing would prevent people from walking off the wall from the parking lot and down 17' to Dudley Place.

Mr. Zitmoresky said a 44" guardrail would suffice in preventing people from walking off the retaining wall.

Mr. Fontane said the fence is provided because the retaining wall is flush with the parking lot. He added that a 4' fence is sufficient in preventing people from walking off the retaining wall. Mr. Cleaves said a 6' fence on top of the retaining wall is provided to deter people from climbing over fence.

Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle motion and seconded by Mr. Truman, the Board voted 4-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan with the condition that six copies address of a final revised Definitive Site Plan are submitted to the Division of Planning & Regulatory Services prior to the release of the decision with the following modifications:

- Annotate all lighting on plan
- Revise lighting locations on the rendering to match the site plan
- Install security cameras that provide full coverage of the site
- Increase the width of the sidewalk between the parking lot and building entrance from 5' to 6'
- Provide new fencing around the site perimeter
- Install decorative fencing where the site abuts Jaques Avenue
- Install additional landscaping on the building's northwestern side, along the driveway

List of Exhibits.

- Exhibit A: 25 Queen Street Application; received March 29, 2012; prepared by Attorney Robert Longden for South Middlesex Non-Profit Housing Corporation.
- Exhibit B: 25 Queen St. – Definitive Site Plan; dated March 2012, received March 29, 2012, revised April 20, 2012, received April 23, 2012 prepared by Whitman & Bingham Associates.
- Exhibit C: Building Elevation – 25 Queen Street, received March 29, 2012, prepared by Gavin & Sullivan Architects, Inc, dated March 27, 2012.
- Exhibit D: Drainage Analysis – 25 Queen Street, dated March 26, 2012; received March 29, 2012.
- Exhibit E: Letter from John Kelly, Building Commissioner to Atty. Robert Longden; re: response to reasonable regulation Dover Amendment; dated April 5, 2012.
- Exhibit F: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Department of Public Works & Parks to the Worcester Planning Board; re: 25 Queen Street, dated April 24, 2012.

- Exhibit G: Letter from Attorney Robert Longden to John Kelly, Department of Inspectional Services, dated April 30, 2012, re: 25 Queen St. reasonable regulations pursuant to Dover Amendment.
- Exhibit H: Comment Form from the Worcester Fire Department – 25 Queen St., received April 29, 2012.
- Exhibit I: Lighting Plan – 25 Queen Street, received April 30, 2012, prepared by Whitman Bingham Associates.
- Exhibit J: Letter from John Kelly, Building Commissioner to Atty. Robert Longden; re: South Middlesex Opportunity Council – New Worcester Triage and Assessment Center; dated May 1, 2012.
- Exhibit K: Images: Proposed retaining wall material (concrete block), received May 2, 2012.
- Exhibit L: Email from Atty. Jonathan Finkelstein for Mike Ushkurnis, email 37 and 47 Jacques Avenue, received May 2, 2012.

Other Business

4. Danvers Street – Convert to Public (ST-2012-007)

Items #4-6 were taken contemporaneously.

Mr. Adams said the items were street petitions for private way conversion and stated that DPW recommended all as Priority 1.

Upon a motion by Mr. Truman and seconded by Mr. Rolle, the Board voted 4-0 to recommend Danvers Street, Westdale Street, and Duluth Street as Priority 1.

5. Westdale Street – Convert to Public (ST-2012-008)

Items #4-6 were taken contemporaneously.

6. Duluth Street – Convert to Public (ST-2012-009)

Items #4-6 were taken contemporaneously.

7. Brookside Avenue – Convert to Public (ST-2012-008)

Mr. Adams said DPW was gathering information regarding Brookside Avenue and was unable to provide a recommendation until more research was done. The Board took no action and held the petition.

8. Woodcliffe Avenue Frontage Subdivision – mylar signing (PB-2012-008)

Items #8 & 9 were taken contemporaneously.

Ms. Bold said the mylars for Woodcliffe Avenue and Westland Street were not certified by the City Clerk and could not yet be signed by the Planning Board.

9. 4-6 Westland Street Frontage Subdivision – mylar signing (PB-2012-008)

Items #8 & 9 were taken contemporaneously.

10. Reconsideration of Conditions of Approval – Removal of a Portion of LaChapelle Street from the Official Map (ST-2011-009)

Mr. Adams said the item before the Board is a reconsideration of the conditions of approval for the removal of LaChapelle Street from the official map. On May 25, 2011, the Planning Board approved the petition with the condition that a slope easement is conveyed to the City of Worcester because of its potential grading impact to an abutting, under-construction subdivision. He said the petitioner seeks removal of the easement in order to sell the property. DPW has indicated it no longer requires the slope easement because it would not affect the subdivision if completed. Mr. Adams said DPW recommended that the Board remove the following conditions:

- That the petitioner convey a properly executed and recorded slope easement to the City of Worcester's Department of Public Works & Parks. The easement is for grading work necessary for the construction of the LaChapelle Street Subdivision as per the definitively approved plan;
- That the petitioner provides evidence of the above-mentioned recording and conveyance to the Division of Planning & Regulatory Services.

Mr. Traynor from the Law Department stated that the Board must make a motion to revise the previous decision.

Upon a motion by Mr. Truman and seconded by Mr. Rolle, the Board voted 4-0 to revise the previous decision and delete the easement conditions.

11. Arboretum Phase III – Bittersweet Boulevard – Requested Bond Reduction

Ms. Bold said the petitioner, Robert Gallo, requested that the performance bond be reduced from, \$760,000 to \$260,000. She explained that the original request was only for a street portion and the \$760,000 bond was calculated for the entire street length (Sta. 0+25 to Sta. 14+48.81).

Mr. Adams from DPW confirmed Ms. Bold's statement and recommended a revision to the bond amount. He said DPW recommended a \$260,000 performance bond for Bittersweet Boulevard (Sta.0+15 to Sta. 4+71).

Upon a motion by Mr. Truman and seconded by Mr. Rolle, the Board voted 4-0 to recommend a \$260,000 performance bond for Bittersweet Boulevard (Sta. 0+15 to Sta. 4+71).

12. Approval Not Required Plans

a. Maple Tree Lane / Fairfield Street (AN-2012-014)

Ms. Bold said there was an existing dwelling at 26 Maple Tree Lane and that the applicant seeks to raze a detached garage and subdivide the property into two lots. Both lots would be located on public streets and meet the minimum frontage requirement (65') in a RL-7 zone. Lot 1 will provide 100.37' of frontage and Parcel A 100.62.'

Upon a motion by Mr. Mitra and seconded by Mr. Rolle, the Board voted 4-0 to endorse the ANR.

b. Lanesboro Road (AN-2012-012)

The applicant seeks to subdivide the property into two lots along a public street. Both lots would meet the minimum frontage requirement (65') in a RS-7 zone Lot 1 will provide 78' of frontage and Lot 2 will provide 86.'

Upon a motion by Mr. Mitra and seconded by Mr. Rolle, the Board voted 4-0 to endorse the ANR.

c. Billow Street (AN-2012-011)

Ms. Bold said there was an existing dwelling at 7 Billow Street and that the applicant seeks to subdivide the property into two lots along a public street. Lot 167A provides 65' of frontage and Lot 166A is labeled 'Not to be considered a building lot' as it only provides 35' of the minimum frontage requirement (65') required in a RS-7 district.

Upon a motion by Mr. Truman and seconded by Mr. Rolle, the Board voted 4-0 to endorse the ANR.

d. 500 Lincoln Street / 10 Country Club Boulevard (AN-2012-013)

The applicant seeks to change the interior lot line for a property zoned BG-3.0 and BG-4.0. The combined parcel has no minimum frontage requirement because its proposed use is commercial. While no frontage is required, Lincoln Street will provide 300' and Country Club Boulevard will provide 380.'

Upon a motion by Mr. Mitra and seconded by Mr. Rolle, the Board voted 4-0 to endorse the ANR.

ADJOURNMENT:

Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Truman the Board voted 4-0 to adjourn the meeting at 8:07 P.M.