



JONATHAN F. MITCHELL
MAYOR

City of New Bedford
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

133 William Street, New Bedford, Massachusetts 02740
Telephone: (508) 979.1488 Facsimile: (508) 979.1576

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
NEW BEDFORD CITY HALL – 3rd Floor
WILLIAM STREET
NEW BEDFORD, MA
Thursday, April 11, 2019

MINUTES

- PRESENT:** John Walsh (*Vice – Chairperson*)
Stephen Brown, *Clerk*
Allen Decker
Robert Schilling
Laura Parrish
- ABSENT:** Leo Schick (*Chairperson*)
- STAFF:** Angela Goncalves, *Assistant Project Manager*
Danny Romanowicz, *Commissioner of Buildings and Inspectional Services*

CITY CLERK
2019 MAY 24 A 10:34
CITY CLERKS OFFICE
NEW BEDFORD, MA

1. CALL TO ORDER

Acting Chairperson Walsh called the meeting of the City of New Bedford Zoning Board of Appeals to order at 6:00 p.m. He then explained the meeting process and protocol.

Acting Chairperson Walsh noted a continuance requested on Case #4372.

A motion was made (SB) and seconded (AD) that Case #4372 be opened and brought forward, and then continued to the April 25, 2019 meeting.

Motion passed unopposed.

2. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

ITEM 1 - CASE #4368 - Petition of: Tom Alexandre "Trustee", NB 18 Realty Trust & 26A Realty Trust, (56 Potomska Street, New Bedford, MA 02745), Gregory J. Koldys, Esq., Koldys & Kelleher, P.C., (449A Faunce Corner Road, N. Dartmouth, MA 02747) and Michael Panagakos (133 Faunce Corner Road, Dartmouth, MA 02747) for an Administrative Appeal under Chapter 9, Comprehensive Zoning Sections 5220 (powers) and 5223 (to hear and decide appeals taken by

Note: These are minutes only. A complete copy of the meeting audio is available on the City of New Bedford website at: <http://www.newbedford-ma.gov/cable-access/government-access-channel-18/program-schedule/>

any person aggrieved by reason of his inability to obtain a permit or enforcement action from any administrative officer under the provisions of M.G.L.A. c. 40A, §§ 7, 8 and 15); relative to property located at 56 Potomska Street & 756 S. Water Street, Assessors' map 31 lot 232 & 239 in an Industrial B [IB] zoned district. The petitioners are seeking to appeal the Planning Board's (January 18, 2019) decision approving the Site Plan for the proposed construction of a 5,000 SF convenience store with gas station and a drive thru per plans filed.

A motion was made (SB) and seconded (RS) that the following be received and placed on file: communication from the Commissioner of Buildings and Inspectional Services dated 2/28/19; communication from the Office of the City Planner dated 3/22/19; the appeal package as submitted; the plans as submitted; and, that the owners of the lots as indicated are the ones deemed by this board to be the lots affected; and the action of the clerk in giving notice of the hearing as stated be and hereby is ratified.

Motion passed unopposed.

Att. Greg Koldys, representing the appellant, stated the planning board approval was for a site plan for construction of a gas station/convenience store with a Dunkin Donuts drive-thru. He stated one of the rules is compliance with zoning ordinances. He then read into the record Section 2210. He stated the property, in an Industrial B zone, had a portion of the building as a Dunkin Donuts drive-thru, which would be considered a fast-food operation, which are not an allowed use in the Industrial B zone. He added that the operation could not exist on its own in that location without variance relief. He stated that only as an accessory use could they be allowed to operate, under 2310 of Zoning Ordinances. He read various associated sections of the Zoning Ordinances, as well as the Black's Law definition. He stated that it must be commonly, habitually and by long practice been established as reasonably associated, noting that many gas stations do not have Dunkin Donuts operations within them. He then stated the definition of an accessory use as determined by the Supreme Judicial Court.

Att. Koldys stated the planning board decision does not state whether they considered this to be an accessory use or whether it could exist on an Industrial B property. He added that the convenience store is free to sell donuts through their own employees as they perform their other duties. He suggested Dunkin Donut employees selling donuts out of the drive-thru is like operating separate business. He continued his legal arguments, noting the site plan approval also fails to account for the required off-street parking. He elaborated on the same, noting the two businesses' parking requirements were not added together, as the site plan was approved with only 18 spaces instead of 47 spaces, a substantial lack of spaces for two of the businesses generating a high volume of morning traffic. Att. Koldys expressed concern that area traffic would become substantially congested with essentially three businesses on the site and effect his client.

In response to Board Member Brown, Att. Koldys stated his client leased to property on Conway Street, which did have a Dunkin Donuts operation, which he believes is moving to the subject location.

In response to Board Member Walsh, Att. Koldys stated a special permit was granted in connection with this development, which is being appealed in court. He stated the special permit regarded operation use and reduction of parking. He acknowledges he is before the board in light of having to exhaust his administrative remedies. Att. Koldys responded that he is unaware

Note: These are minutes only. A complete copy of the meeting audio is available on the City of New Bedford website at: <http://www.newbedford-ma.gov/cable-access/government-access-channel-18/program-schedule/>

whether the planning board heard issues on accessory use, as nothing in their decision reflects that.

Commissioner Dan Romanowicz submitted materials to the board.

A motion was made (SB) and seconded (LP) to receive the Commissioner Romanowicz's 4/11/19 letter and associated exhibits.

Motion passed unopposed.

Commissioner Romanowicz noted the letter is in reference to a requested opinion regarding 380 Hathaway Road, including the facts that show the property is zoned business on the west side and discussed a related conversation with Ana Rosa at DPI on 2/25/19 regarding accessory uses. He explained the documents, noting the coffee shop with the convenience store is an as of right accessory use. He noted this was also the case with a shop in the Industrial Park.

Att. Koldys commented on the letter's statement that the Building Department's opinion is that a coffee shop is an accessory use to a convenience store.

In response to Board Member Schilling, Att. Koldys stated his understanding is that the existing Dunkin Donuts on Rte. 18 will be moved to the subject site.

Att. Edward J. Sylvia, representing the appellees, stated the position of the accessory use decision dates back to 2008 from the prior administration/building department and has carried forward. Mr. Sylvia offered correspondence.

A motion was made (SB) and seconded (LP) to enter the SITEC letter of 3/18/19.
Motion passed unopposed.

Att. Sylvia described the site in question. He stated this will improve the work being done in the south end area. He mentioned an old warehouse presently on the site, as well as the existing convenience store which will both be torn down. He noted that the total 89,000 s/f presently existing buildings will be replaced by a 5,000 s/f building. He addressed the storm water plan, landscaping plans, utility plans, as well as the stacking in drive-by lanes. Att. Sylvia spoke of the demolition plan and removal of property billboards. Att. Sylvia continued to detail their plans as approved by the planning board. He then addressed the parking.

In response to Acting Chairperson Walsh's invitation for interested parties to speak, Jennifer Garner, representing Daily Grind II, owner and operator of the subject Dunkin Donuts, stated this appeal is a business dispute. She reminded the board of a recent appeal for 101 Belleville, and noted it involved the same parties. She stated the Planning Board considered all that is required of them under Section 5470.

She stated there is a longstanding history, dating back to 2008, of siting these stores as an accessory use. She noted the similar setups on other projects before the board this evening, stating the planning board would have acted arbitrarily and capriciously to decide otherwise. She asked the board to deny the appeal.

*Note: These are minutes only. A complete copy of the meeting audio is available on the City of New Bedford website at:
<http://www.newbedford-ma.gov/cable-access/government-access-channel-18/program-schedule/>*

There was no response to Acting Chairperson Walsh's further invitation to speak.

By way of rebuttal, Att. Koldys stated the Dunkin Donuts operation was represented as 40% of the property. He noted the spaces at the pumps are being counted as extra parking spaces, noting that even counting these results in the plan still being short. He stated this is not a business dispute, as another tenant on Conway Street is already in place. Att. Koldys stated Mr. Romanowicz had commented and again reiterated the Black's Law definition of an accessory use. He stated only three stations/stores in the city have such an additional use.

The hearing was declared closed.

After discussion by the board, including accessory use, parking and other issues considered by the planning board, a motion was made (SB) and seconded (RS) to grant the appeal under provisions of the City Code of New Bedford relative to property located at 56 Potomska Street & 756 S. Water Street, Assessors' map 31 lot 232 & 239 in an Industrial B [IB] zoned district, to grant the petitioner's appeal for the planning board's January April 2019 decision approving the site plan for proposed construction of a 5,000 SF convenience store with gas station and a drive thru per plans filed. A motion was made to approve the administrative appeal, that the appeal of the petitioner be granted per the administrative appeal process under provisions of Chapter 9 Comprehensive Zoning Sections 5220 and 5223.

Having reviewed this petition in light of the City of New Bedford Code of Ordinances under Chapter 9, sections as cited, and under M.G.L. Chapter 40A, the board finds the following facts:

- The appellant contends that an associated restaurant with a drive-thru is a fast food establishment, which is not an allowed use in an Industrial B District;
- The appellant further contends that a portion of the convenience store building for a fast food restaurant is not an accessory use to the convenience store/gas station.
- No additional evidence was provided regarding the appellant's argument as it related to parking issues created by the decision of the planning board. Issues regarding parking were heard.
- Mr. Romanowicz, Acting Commissioner of the Department of Inspectional Services, gave testimony that the accessory use was proper;
- The attorney for the appellee contended and provided evidence that in 2008 a letter was provided by the Department of inspectional Services supporting the contention that at that time the coffee shop within the variety store/gas station was deemed an accessory use.

ROLL CALL VOTE AS FOLLOWS:

Acting Chairperson Walsh - No
Board Member Parrish - No
Board Member Brown - No

Board Member Schilling - No
Board Member Decker - No

Motion failed 0-5

The board took a brief recess and the resumed proceedings.

*Note: These are minutes only. A complete copy of the meeting audio is available on the City of New Bedford website at:
<http://www.newbedford-ma.gov/cable-access/government-access-channel-18/program-schedule/>*

ITEM 2: Cases #4369/4370 -

Case #4369 - Petition of: Angelique Castriano (255 MacArthur Drive, New Bedford, MA 02740) for a Variance under Chapter 9, Comprehensive Zoning Sections 2700 (dimensional regulation), 2710 (general), 2711 (lot change - no existing conforming); relative to property located at WS Stephen Street, Assessors' map 22 lot 62 in a Residential B [RB] zoned district. The petitioner proposes to construct a 30'X40' single family dwelling per plans filed. The lot merged with the property located at 19 Stephen Street after the owner purchased them.

Case #4370 - Petition of: Angelique Castriano (255 MacArthur Drive, New Bedford, MA 02740) for a Special Permit under Chapter 9, Comprehensive Zoning Sections 2400 (nonconforming uses and structures), 2410 (applicability), 2420-2422 (nonconforming use), 2470 (reversion to nonconformity. No nonconforming use shall, if changed to a conforming use, revert to a nonconforming use) and 5300-5330 & 5360-5390 (special permit); relative to property located at 19 Stephen Street, Assessors' map 22 lot 67 in a Residential B [RB] zoned district. The petitioner proposes to separate lot 62 from lot 67 which were merged for zoning purposes on September 4, 1998 creating a lot containing 13,498 SF. The separation would leave lot 67 with 4,498 SF which does not comply with the zoning requirements for a three-family dwelling per plans filed.

A motion was made (SB) and seconded (RS) that the following be received and placed on file: communication from the Commissioner of Buildings and Inspectional Services dated 3/1/19; communication from the Office of the City Planner dated 3/22/19; the appeal package as submitted; the plans as submitted; and, that the owners of the lots as indicated are the ones deemed by this board to be the lots affected; and the action of the clerk in giving notice of the hearing as stated be and hereby is ratified.

Motion passed unopposed.

A motion was made (SB) and seconded (LP) that the following be received and placed on file: communication from the Commissioner of Buildings and Inspectional Services dated 3/1/19; communication from the Office of the City Planner dated 3/22/19; the appeal package as submitted; the plans as submitted; and, that the owners of the lots as indicated are the ones deemed by this board to be the lots affected; and the action of the clerk in giving notice of the hearing as stated be and hereby is ratified.

Motion passed unopposed.

A motion was made (SB) and seconded (LP) to consolidate the afore-mentioned two cases.

Motion passed unopposed.

Angelique Castriano, 19 Stephen Street, property owner of both lots, stated she purchased the separately deeded and taxed lots approximately 2-2.5 years ago with the intention of building on the other lot. She stated that in order to split the WS Stephen Street lot and the 19 Stephen Street lot a non-conforming lot would be created at 19 Stephen Street. She explained the driveway between the two properties, noting the driveway would need to be relocated to the other side of the existing house in order to provide the necessary room on the vacant lot, resulting in the special permit request. She referenced that required parking for the existing 3-unit dwelling is 2 spots

Note: These are minutes only. A complete copy of the meeting audio is available on the City of New Bedford website at: <http://www.newbedford-ma.gov/cable-access/government-access-channel-18/program-schedule/>

per unit. She proposes to move 4 spots to the other side of the house rather than 6 in order to maintain the green space requirement. She stated she proposes to split the two lots up; the house lot, Lot 22-67, remaining the same size as all other lots on the street. She noted that as she is still providing parking, there will be no impact on street parking/traffic. She added the new house built will also have 2 parking spots. She stated the current vacant lot is overrun with weeds and is an eyesore and is the only empty lot on the street and brings down area property values. She also noted her tax bill on the vacant lot.

In response to Board Member Walsh, Ms. Castriano stated she has never received one tax bill for both lots.

Ms. Castriano stated putting a house on the site would generate more tax revenue. She stated it is currently taxed as a buildable lot.

In response to Board Member Parrish, Ms. Castriano stated the proposed house is approximately a 2,400 s/f two floor single-family, with a 30' x 40' foundation.

Board Member Decker consulted with Commissioner Romanowicz regarding the merger purpose. Commissioner Romanowicz concurred and added they are also merged because of combined use of the second lot, as confirmed by site visit. In response to Board Member Decker, Commissioner Romanowicz confirmed it is a Residential and the 9,000 SF lot conforms to zoning, but the result is that the first lot is substantially undersized and lacking frontage. Board Member Decker explained the issue in detail to Ms. Castriano.

Ms. Castriano reiterated that allowing the variance would only result in the non-conforming lot being the same size as all other lots on the street.

There was no response to Acting Chairperson Walsh's invitation to speak in favor.

In response to Acting Chairperson Walsh's invitation to speak in opposition, Roy Saulnier, a direct abutter, expressed concerns about PCBs in the neighborhood and listed some of the former dumps in the neighborhood; namely, Blue Meadows Housing, Stackhouse Street feast grounds. He requested the PCBs be checked prior to building. Mr. Saulnier expressed concern about water problems in his cellar.

Acting Chairperson Walsh explained that the issue is not under the control of this board.

In response to Acting Chairperson Walsh's invitation to speak in opposition, Deborah Saulnier disclosed she takes down meeting minutes, and has no voting influence. She also raised concerns with the soil condition. She stated Ms. Castriano represented that at purchase her plan was to build a single family. Ms. Saulnier stated having bought the property, and having knowledge of the merger, Ms. Castriano created her own hardship. She added that allowing the zoning to be nullified may be spot zoning. Ms. Saulnier submitted photos of the neighborhood, noting that many of the lots are double lots, separately taxed. She stated the parcels were not maintained as separate parcels, and separated parcels are unique in the area. She quoted the ordinance that the granting of the variance would violate and nullify. She stated it will affect the public good due to the parking, lack of green space, and additional curb cuts effecting street parking. She stated she

Note: These are minutes only. A complete copy of the meeting audio is available on the City of New Bedford website at: <http://www.newbedford-ma.gov/cable-access/government-access-chanel-18/program-schedule/>

also felt the way the parking is represented in the plan would result in some danger regarding ingress/egress. Ms. Saulnier submitted photos.

A motion was made (SB) and seconded (LP) to receive photos.
Motion passed unopposed.

In response to Acting Chairperson Walsh's invitation to speak in opposition, Nicole Saulnier stated the planned parking area is not an equivalent amount of space for parking and will create parking problems on the site and on the street, as well as green space problems. She added that other properties on the street allot for two off-street parking spaces, not 4-6.

There was no response to Acting Chairperson Walsh's further invitation to speak or be recorded in opposition.

By way of rebuttal, Ms. Castriano stated the one driveway opening will remain, and a second driveway opening will be made on the other side of the house. She reiterated the lots on the street are the same size at 4,498 s/f. She offered to work with the board regarding water testing and grading. She stated she did not know upon purchase that separating the lots would be a problem.

Ms. Saulnier stated her father wondered if the house was being built to sell. She stated the existing driveway is approximately one foot in distance to the non-conforming lot. She stated the application reflects Ms. Castriano as listed owner of one parcel, and a realty trust as owner of the other parcel. Ms. Saulnier stated she has not seen Ms. Castriano on the property, but for two times, and therefore disputes her claim that she currently lives on the property. She noted the contradiction in the mailing addresses listed on the application.

The hearing was closed.

Board Member Decker consulted with Ms. Goncalves regarding the recording of the property deeds. Ms. Goncalves also noted that the parking reduction issue would require appearance before the Planning Board. Board Member Brown consulted with Ms. Goncalves and Commissioner Romanowicz regarding the issues between the variance and the special permit.

Acting Chairperson Walsh saw no issue with the deeds. In response to Acting Chairperson Walsh Ms. Castriano responded that she does own both lots. Acting Chairperson Walsh noted that both quitclaim deeds appear to relate to 19 Stephen Street. Board Member Decker noted differing descriptions on the deeds.

After board discussion, to include the merger timeframe of the property lots, the board's action creating a non-conforming lot, and the other requirements for the granting of the variance within the law.

Board Member Schilling stated he would abstain from voting due to a conflict.

Acting Chairperson Walsh explained to Ms. Castriano that in light of Board Member Schilling's recusal, she would need a unanimous vote of the remaining board members or she had the option of continuing to another hearing with a new board.

Ms. Castriano stated she wanted an answer/vote this evening.

There being no further discussion, a motion was made (SB) and seconded (LP) to grant a variance under provisions of the City Code of New Bedford relative to property located at WS Stephen Street, Assessors' map 22 lot 62 in a Residential B [RB] zoned district, to allow the petitioner to construct a 30'X40' single family dwelling per plans filed. The lot merged with the property located at 19 Stephen Street, which requires a variance under provisions of Chapter 9 Comprehensive Zoning Sections 2700, 2710, 2711.

Having reviewed the petition in light of the City of New Bedford Code of Ordinances Chapter 9, Comprehensive Zoning Sections as cited, the board finds that with respect to these sections, the applicable sections have been addressed. In addition to the foregoing sections, the petition has been found to be in accordance with M.G.L. Chapter 40A relative to the granting of variances. This determination includes consideration of the following:

First, that there are circumstances related to the soil conditions, shape or topography especially effecting the land or structure in question, but which do not generally effect the zoning district in which the land or structure is located. In this instance, the circumstances are 19 Stephen Street and WS Stephen Street are merged by common ownership but if distinguished as spate parcels would produce productive use of land presently prevented by literal enforcement of the zoning ordinance. Second, due to those circumstances especially effecting the land or structure, literal enforcement of the provisions of the zoning ordinance or bylaw would involve substantial hardship, financial or otherwise, to the petitioner or appellant. In this case, the hardship is appellant is unable to make beneficial use of the lot, notwithstanding her municipal tax burden for it. Third, the desirable relief may be granted without nullifying or substantially derogating from the intent or purpose of the zoning ordinance or bylaw, and that the desirable relief may be granted without substantial detriment to the public good.

In light of its review of the specifics of this case, the applicable sections of the city's zoning ordinances, the findings subsequently made on these items, along with all properly submitted materials and testimony made, and the board's careful consideration of the petitioner's request, the Zoning Board of Appeals finds that the petition satisfactorily meets the basis of the requested relief.

With specific conditions as follows: The project requires approval by the New Bedford Planning Board, and any conditions imposed by the Planning Board decision shall also be conditions of this variance. General conditions are as follows: that the project be set forth according to the plans submitted with the application; that the applicant shall ensure a copy of the Notice of Decision bearing certification from the City Clerk's Office be recorded at the Registry of Deeds; and that the rights authorized by the granting of the variance must be exercised by issuance of a building permit by the Department of Inspectional Services and acted upon within one year from the date the decision was granted or they will lapse.

Note: These are minutes only. A complete copy of the meeting audio is available on the City of New Bedford website at: <http://www.newbedford-ma.gov/cable-access/government-access-channel-18/program-schedule/>

Roll-call vote as follows:

Acting Chairperson Walsh - No
Board Member Parrish - No
Board Member Schilling - Abstained

Board Member Brown - Yes
Board Member Decker - No

Motion failed 1-3

Board Member Decker noted that the failure of the variance results in the special permit not needing to be addressed.

Acting Chairperson Walsh recused himself from the next case to be heard. Board Member Decker assumed chairmanship of the meeting.

ITEM 3 – Case 4371 - 71 petition of: Wamsutta II, LLC (218 Willard Street, Quincy, MA 02169), Christopher Saunders, Esquire (700 Pleasant Street, New Bedford, MA 02740) and Farland Corp., C/O Matthew White (401 County Street, New Bedford, MA 02740) for a Special Permit under Chapter 9, Comprehensive Zoning Sections 4100A-4172A (Wamsutta Mill Overlay District- WMOD) and 5300-5330 & 5360-5390 (special permit); relative to property located at 61 Wamsutta Street, Assessors' map 78 lot 125 in an Industrial B [IB] zoned district. The petitioner proposes to construct 33 units of rental housing in the "Matouk Building" within the Wamsutta Mill Complex per plans filed.

A motion was made (SB) and seconded (LP) that the following be received and placed on file: communication from the Commissioner of Buildings and Inspectional Services dated 3/1/19; communication from the Office of the City Planner dated 3/22/19; the appeal package as submitted; the plans as submitted; and, that the owners of the lots as indicated are the ones deemed by this board to be the lots affected; and that the action of the clerk in giving notice of the hearing as stated be and hereby is ratified.

Motion passed unopposed.

Board Member Decker informed the applicant that due to Board Member Walsh's recusal, the applicant would need a unanimous vote, which Att. Saunders acknowledged, and elected to proceed.

A motion was made (AD) and seconded (LP) to receive and place on file correspondence dated 4/11/19 from Ward 3 Councilor Dunn stating his support of the application.

Motion passed unopposed.

Att. Chris Saunders, on behalf of the applicant, provided a project history, noting he represented Wamsutta, LLC in 2006 when they sought to redevelop the old Wamsutta Mill. He stated the special permit granted at that time allowed for the rehab of the building into residential dwelling units. The Matouk Building was included in the overall plan. He stated the recession that affected the housing market put the project on the back burner. The economy improvements bring the applicant back before the board.

Att. Saunders stated they are proposing the 27,000 s/f building be converted on the interior only to 2 floors containing 33 dwelling units. He then provided the breakdown. He stated after

Note: These are minutes only. A complete copy of the meeting audio is available on the City of New Bedford website at: <http://www.newbedford-ma.gov/cable-access/government-access-channel-18/program-schedule/>

consulting various departments the applicant does not need to revisit site plan approval. He addressed issues with a loading dock to be removed on the exterior and replaced with a walkway, as well as an addition of handicap parking.

Att. Saunders stated there are 80 spaces on the lot, meeting parking requirements. He explained why parking relief was included in this special permit request. He stated they are asking for residential dwelling units in an industrial zoned overlay district. He stated they also seek relief for green space coverage and setbacks. He added the applicant is now on a tight schedule and the project would commence immediately upon the approval.

Att. Saunders addressed the staff comments and necessary criteria, noting he agreed with staff comments. He then spoke in detail on the six criteria the board needs to consider and invited questions.

Board Member Schilling confirmed the property is in walking distance of the planned train station.

In response to Board Member Decker's invitation to speak or be recorded in favor of the project, the Quentin Ricciardi, CEO of Acorn, Quincy, MA, asked the board to consider the city projects they have done, noting they take pride in their projects as they try to be good citizens of the city. He assured the board of the quality they can expect in this project.

There was no response to Board Member Decker's further invitation to speak or be recorded in favor.

There was no response to Board Member Decker's invitation to speak or be recorded in opposition.

The hearing was closed.

After brief board discussion, a motion was made (SB) and seconded (LP) to grant a special permit under the City Code of New Bedford relative to property located at 61 Wamsutta Street, Assessors' map 78 lot 125 in an Industrial B [IB] zoned district, to allow the petitioner to construct 33 units of rental housing in the "Matouk Building" within the Wamsutta Mill Complex per plans filed, which requires a special permit under provisions of Chapter 9, Comprehensive Zoning Sections 4100A-4172A and 5300-5330 & 5360-5390. In accordance with City of New Bedford Code of Ordinances Chapter 9, Section 5320, the benefit to the city and the neighborhood outweighs the adverse effects of the proposed use, taking into account the characteristics of the site and of the proposal in relation to that site.

This determination includes consideration of each of the following:

The social, economic or community needs served by the proposal. In this case, a successful mill rehabilitation project and provision of safe adequate housing for citizenry of the city promotes and serves social and economic community needs. Concerning traffic flow and safety, including parking and loading, the city staff has acknowledged that the proposed use does not require site plan review by the planning board, as already approved in 2006. Regarding the adequacy of utilities and other public services, there are adequate utilities and services serving the area. Regarding the neighborhood character and social structures, this proposed use is not out of

Note: These are minutes only. A complete copy of the meeting audio is available on the City of New Bedford website at: <http://www.newbedford-ma.gov/cable-access/government-access-channel-18/program-schedule/>

character with the neighborhood. Regarding the impacts on the natural environment, in this case there are minimal proposed exterior changes. Regarding potential fiscal impact, including impacts on city services, tax base and employment, the staff acknowledges the proposal would add employment while providing residential uses.

With no specific conditions, but with general conditions as follows: that the project be set forth according to the plans submitted with the application; that the applicant ensure a copy of the Notice of Decision bearing certification from the City Clerk's Office be recorded at the Registry of Deeds; and that the rights authorized by the granting of this special permit must be exercised by issuance of a building permit by the Department of Inspectional Services and acted upon within one year from the date the decision was granted or they will lapse.

Roll-call vote as follows:

Board Member Schilling - Yes

Board Member Brown - Yes

Board Member Decker - Yes

Board Member Parrish - Yes

Motion passes 4-0

Board Member Decker announced that the next regularly scheduled meeting will be held, Thursday, April 25, 2019.

4. ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was declared adjourned at 8:04 p.m.

NEXT MEETING SCHEDULED FOR April 25, 2019.


Stephen Brown, Clerk


Date