



Planning Board

October 7, 2015 – 6:00 PM – **Approved Minutes**
New Bedford City Hall, Room 314, 133 William Street

NEW BEDFORD FREE LIBRARY
613 PLEASANT STREET
Public Meeting Room - 3rd Floor
WEDNESDAY OCTOBER 7, 2015
6:00 P.M.

MEETING MINUTES

- PRESENT:** Colleen Dawicki, Chairperson
Kathryn Duff
Arthur Glassman
Peter Cruz
Alexander Kalife
- ABSENT:** No member absent
- STAFF:** Jennifer Clarke, AICP, Deputy Director of Planning & Community Development and Acting City Planner
Constance Brawders, Staff Planner
- IN ATTENDANCE:** Michael Galasso, 200 Palmer Avenue, Falmouth, MA 02540
Michael A. Kehoe, 128 Union Street, Suite 500, New Bedford, MA 02740
Marc R. Deshaies, 388 County Street, New Bedford, MA 02740
Antonio Braz
Ken Resendes, 125 Holly Street, New Bedford, MA 02740
Maria Pine, 63 Pamela Street, New Bedford, MA 02740
Joe Pine, 63 Pamela Drive, New Bedford, MA 02740
Thomas Hardman, 11 Cushman Street, Middleboro, MA 02346
Henry Bousquet, Ward 3 Councillor, 228 Mt. Pleasant Street, New Bedford, MA 02746
Dennis McCarthy, 216 Foster Street, Lowell, MA 01851
David Alves, Councillor-at-Large, 133 Williams Street, RM 215, New Bedford, MA 02740
Linda Morad, Councillor-at-Large, 133 Williams Street, RM 215, New Bedford, MA 02740

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Dawicki called the meeting of the City of New Bedford Planning Board to order at 6:22 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

A formal roll call was conducted confirming members present as stated above.

3. MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL

Ms. Dawicki asked board members for approval of the previous meeting minutes.

A motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to approve the September 9, 2015 meeting minutes. Motion passed unopposed.

Ms. Dawicki then requested taking the agenda out of order.

A motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to take out of order Case #24-15. Motion passed unopposed.

PUBLIC HEARING

4. CASE 24-15: Request by the New Bedford City Councillor David Alves for recommendation by the Planning Board for the reclassification of a lot on Oakdale Street, located at Map 74, Lot 95, from: half residence A and half residence B zoning districts, to: Residence B zoning district, to allow for reconstruction/replacement of a building destroyed by fire.

Ms. Clarke stated they are in receipt of correspondence from Mark Deshaies on behalf of an abutter, which challenges the legality of the actual add placed related to this hearing being identical to the information city council. She stated the add describes the property incorrectly in terms of zoning as half Residence A and half Residence B, when in fact the subject property is completely Residence A. She recommended, under advice of counsel, that this being merely a recommendation to the city council the board continue the hearing.

Councillor David Alves addressed the board stating that what was before them was a letter from legal counsel for one of the abutters and is a non-binding recommendation, not a definitive action. Recommendations parcels of land, being 1A and 1B and he believes they were both part of the two unit condo building. He stated they are looking to replace the building. He stated the original building was built in the 1950's and they are looking to build a 2015 style piece of property. He stated they are looking to change the Residential A into Residential B.

Councillor Alves stated that all of the property within the development is Residential B property. He stated it has been part of the development for a number of years. He stated he is seeking action from the board for a recommendation to the full city council. He stated that any issue would come before the city solicitor and she can make an appropriate definitive legal action. He stated he is requesting the recommendation be contiguous that all of the Claremont property Residential B. The neighbor that has a concern relates to a row of arborvitaes that precludes any visibility to this property. The building is contiguous use to all the other pieces of property there. He stated basically they are replacing a burnt out building with a new one. He stated they seek to make the whole parcel Residential B and are looking for a recommendation from this board to the full city council for approval.

A motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to open the public hearing. Motion passed unopposed.

Ms. Dawicki again explained the action before the board this evening is merely for a recommendation to city council.

In response to Ms. Dawicki's invitation to speak or be recorded in favor, Atty. Christopher Saunders of Pleasant Street, on behalf of the property owner Rockdale West, LLC, explained to the board that last December there was a fire at the unit. He stated that after discussion with the city solicitor, it came to his attention that there were two lots, one being an A and one a B zoned lot. The intent is to create that one lot into

one zoning district. He stated the entire Rockdale West development is Residence B and this is the only parcel that is Residence A. He stated the action is to clean up a zoning matter. He stated they had a favorable determination from Building Commissioner Romanowicz that they can rebuild the structures. Atty. Saunders requested the board to vote favorably on the non-binding recommendation. He reiterated what Councillor Alves had stated, that any questions regarding the legal advertisement could be directed to the city solicitor, and he assured the board he would contact them in the morning.

There was no response to Ms. Dawicki's further invitation to speak or be recorded in favor

In response to Ms. Dawicki's invitation to speak or be recorded in opposition, Atty. Mark Deshaies of 388 County Street, New Bedford, stated he intended to make a point of order that the notice that was published is deficient on its face in so far as it identifies the lot incorrectly. He stated the notice requirement is to put the general public on notice as to what, non-binding or otherwise, is before the board in order for them to come and express their agreement or opposition. He sought to have this made a point of order as he does not believe the matter is properly before the board. He stated that notwithstanding it being non-binding, it was not properly noticed by either this board or the city council.

Atty. Deshaies stated that Councillor Alves mentioned the obstructed view created by the arborvitaes. He stated that is not germane at all. He stated this lot has stood for the past 40 plus years as a Residence A lot and there has never been any request at any time to do anything with that lot. He stated Rockdale West had suffered a casualty in the burning down of 120-122 Oakhill. He stated the by-law contains an adequate remedy allowing the property that has been destroyed, now on a non-conforming lot, to rebuild within the same footprint. That is not satisfactory to Rockdale West. He stated what Rockdale West intends to do, unlike Mr. Alves' representation, is not merely reconstruct this building. They want the zoning change to bring a new building of a substantially greater footprint closer to the Silvia's property. He stated in addition it is to reconstruct another building in the middle. What existed previously was two buildings all Residence B. They want to change this in order to enable them to build three buildings. Though they will be modern, this is not consistent with the City of New Bedford planning objectives. This is being singled out solely for a gain to the owner of the property, and that's not how zoning changes come about. Rockdale West wants to build two units with substantially more square footage so that they can derive the benefit of further revenues. Though we are a capitalist country, what you have is basically changing one 3,600 SF lot into a Residence B solely for the purpose of allowing the developer to basically build two new buildings. He again stated that is not the objective of planning, to serve a developer for a punitive gain. And as such, he suggested notwithstanding the fact that the notice is improper, this request for zoning change is inappropriate for this neighborhood.

Ms. Dawicki noted that the board had received a letter from Atty. Deshaies that she would request be put on file.

A motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to place the correspondence on file.
Motion passed unopposed.

In response to Ms. Dawicki's further invitation to speak or be recorded in opposition, Antonio Braz stated there had been problems in the past, and complaints went to the office and they always said it was okay, until one day when he had to call at 1:30am the U-Mass and New Bedford police to the site. He stated that however, was not the issue he wanted to speak of. He stated the land, evening changing to Residential B does not comply with the building code of today to put two buildings. It does not give them enough rear or side footage. He stated he had a set of plans that were something like 4' from the property line, and he does not believe that is the building code.

Mr. Braz stated he knows there is a petition floating around that hasn't one neighbor or the back, front of side of the street that hasn't signed. I ask this board to reconsider what they're trying to do and look at a set of plans of what they intend to do. He stated what they intend to do is a violation of the building code, and if it was me or any other citizen we could not do it. He stated if they want to put a modern building, let them put a unit just where that unit is.

In response to Ms. Dawicki's further invitation to speak or be recorded in opposition, David Burke of Oakdale and Sherwood Street, stated there had been continuous problems there, as the board just heard. He stated he is opposed to this and was not notified what was going to be done to the property. He stated he had a letter from another neighbor in opposition who could not attend tonight's meeting.

A motion was made (PC) and seconded (KD) to place the correspondence on file. Motion passed unopposed.

In response to Ms. Dawicki's further invitation to speak or be recorded in opposition, Maria Pine of 63 Pamela Drive. She stated that what was there was more than enough. She asked the board to consider the surrounding neighbors, four houses. She did not feel they should bring in any more people than are already there. She stated they had all seen the trouble that goes on. She did not think the lot was big enough for the proposed building changes.

There was response to Ms. Dawicki's further invitation to speak or be recorded in opposition.

Ms. Dawicki suspended the public hearing for board discussion. Ms. Dawicki stated the board could make a favorable or unfavorable recommendation or continue so that the advertising issues can addressed.

Mr. Glassman stated this was simply a zoning change issue. He stated whatever the proposed plan, it is not before this board.

In answer to Ms. Dawicki, Ms. Clarke felt that given the scale of the project, she would expect the board would see a site plan, and perhaps even a special permit.

While Mr. Cruz stated he did not believe there are setback changes going from A to B, both Mr. Glassman and Mr. Cruz agreed that proper setbacks are not the purview of this board.

Ms. Dawicki read from her notes on re-zoning parcels and stated that any court would consider the following: the uniformity, such as how the zoning change would resemble surrounding zoning; whether or not a parcel is being singled out for a zoning change, the size, any neighborhood change, impact on economic development, and, as mentioned, whether the benefits are solely to the parcel owner, as that is often considered spot zoning.

Ms. Clarke stated the dimensional requirements between an RA and RB zone are all consistent.

Ms. Duff expressed that in her opinion it was not spot zoning. Mr. Cruz agreed.
Ms. Duff did not feel she could speak as to whether the benefit was solely to the owner of the parcel.

Mr. Cruz mentioned there was already a multi-unit on the parcel now. Mr. Glassman agreed.

Ms. Duff and Mr. Glassman agreed that what goes on the lot would have to come back before the board for site

plan review.

Mr. Cruz confirmed that this evening's action is merely a recommendation.

Ms. Dawicki asked the board for input on whether they wished to make a decision tonight with the legal issue that's been presented.

Mr. Glassman felt in the event it was determined this meeting was not properly held, their recommendation would simply be thrown out.

Mr. Kalife stated that while he did not generally like to push any matters over, he did not feel they had enough information. He stated he felt comfortable moving the matter to later on.

Ms. Duff felt the request was black and white, was not spot zoning, and was merely a request in line with adjacent zoning.

Mr. Kalife stated the only legal issue he saw was a notice problem, and the notice was given, though given poorly. He noted that people still came out to comment on the issue.

Ms. Duff, in response to Mr. Kalife comment, stated that had people misread it and not attended this meeting, then the board does not have all the information or comments from the public. She admitted she had to relook at the matter after reading the notice. She stated that in light of that, she was in favor of a continuance of the matter.

Mr. Cruz agreed.

A motion was made (KD) and seconded (PC) to continue Case #24-15 to the next hearing.
Motion passed unopposed.

As the matter will appear before the city council prior to the next Planning Board meeting, Ms. Clarke stated the city council will be notified that no recommendation was forthcoming as the case was continued.

Ms. Dawicki thanked people for coming out for the case.

Ms. Dawicki requested a motion to take **Case #21-15** out of order.

A motion was made (PC) and seconded (AG) to take Case #21-15 out of order.
Motion passed unopposed.

5. CASE 21-15: Request by applicant, for Site Plan Review for change of use in business from a hair salon service to a health care consulting service, and Special Permit for reduction of parking spaces, located at 269 Maryland Street (Map 127C, Lot 81), in the Mixed Use Business zoning district. Applicant: Heather Brito, 47 Charlotte Street, New Bedford, MA 02740.

Ms. Dawicki stated the case was a continuation of a hearing from the previous month. She stated the applicant had requested the case be withdrawn without prejudice.

A motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to allow Case #21-15 to be withdrawn without prejudice. Motion passed unopposed.

6. CASE #22-15: Request by applicant for Special Permit for reduction of parking spaces, located at 157 Ash Street (Map 45, Lot 93), in the Mixed Use Business zoning district. Applicant: The Resource Inc (TRI) for Community and Economic Development, 200 Palmer Ave, 2nd Floor, Falmouth, MA 02540.

Mike Galasso, project manager for TRI Resource Inc. He stated that as many know, for the last eight years TRI is a non-profit affordable housing developer and has been acquiring and renovating properties in the south end of New Bedford and making them available to first-time homebuyers and low/moderate income renters. He stated the property at 157 Ash Street was brought to their attention as part of the city's receivership team on abandoned properties.

Mr. Galasso stated they are seeking a special permit on reduction in parking. He stated the property has a ground floor retail of approximately 1,000 SF and three one bedroom apartments. He stated an area on the side of the building will safely accommodate three parking spaces. He stated that to encourage other means of transportation in the city, they will add bike storage spaces. He stated they will also add storage spaces. He then introduced the project architect.

Christopher (Kit) Wise, of 514 County Road, Westport, project architect, stated the site was awkward and is made even more so by the existence of the retail space which requires a renovation to make that space accessible. He stated the only way they can do that is to put a ramp up the side of the building. He stated this will reduce the width of the available space on the lot. He stated that even the three parking spaces on the lot, it will result in paving 85% of the lot. He stated they felt one parking space for each one bedroom unit is adequate. He stated the retail space, the use of which is unknown, can adequately be accommodated by street parking, of which there is plenty available.

Mr. Wise stated the building inspector had seen a 1983 parking plan done for this property by a previous owner showing seven diagonal spaces on the lot. He stated that plan would not have worked, as the lot was much too narrow to accommodate those spaces.

A motion was made (PC) and seconded (AG) to accept the parking plan. Motion passed unopposed.

Mr. Wise stated adding any more parking would make it more awkward and would require paving the lot 100%.

Mr. Glassman asked what was currently in the downstairs retail store. Mr. Galasso stated there was nothing there currently. He stated the prior owner had an office, but the building has been vacant for some five years. He stated this is part of their revitalization. The storefront will be redone and hopefully made into a neighborhood coffee shop or something along those lines. He stated the intersection could use some active retail. He assured it would not become another apartment.

Ms. Duff commended the applicant on the proposed project, stating that, given the density of the neighborhood and of the lot and its other challenges, she thought they had done a great job. She believed it was a well needed renovation to the existing structure.

In response to Ms. Duff, Mr. Wise stated there was a plan submitted to the building department which is the plan currently out to bid. He stated that plan eliminated the ramp for budgetary reasons. He stated they will also wait until a tenant is found before re-finishing the retail space. He stated the ramp will not be built until the retail space tenant is found. He noted that even taking away the ramp, it does not provide for more parking spaces on the lot.

Ms. Duff agreed with the statement and noted that she was not looking for more parking, but was trying to consider how a pedestrian would circulate on the site. She inquired as to the material to be used on the driving path. Mr. Wise stated it would be a pervious paving material. Mr. Galasso stated it may even be crushed stone.

Ms. Duff confirmed that the lighter areas shown are areas that will be planted out.

Mr. Cruz also noted that the applicant had done a great job.

Ms. Dawicki noted that technically the applicant would need to come back before the board for a parking reduction in the retail space. She noted the applicant had the option of rolling that into this evening's decision.

Ms. Clarke clarified for the applicant that the requirement is one per 200 SF of gross area, which calculates to four spaces.

Mr. Wise stated they would like to revise the reduction sought from 10 to 3 instead of 6 to 3 to avoid reappearing.

A motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to open the public hearing.
Motion passed unopposed.

There was no response to Ms. Dawicki's invitation to speak or be recorded in favor of the application.
There was no response to Ms. Dawicki's invitation to speak or be recorded in opposition.

A motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to close the public hearing.
Motion passed unopposed.

During board discussion, Mr. Glassman stated he felt it was great that something was finally going to be done with the building. Ms. Duff agreed, being very familiar with the area.

A motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to approve the special permit for reduction in parking from ten spaces to three spaces for Case #22-15.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

A. Kalife – Yes K. Duff - Yes
P. Cruz – Yes C. Dawicki– Yes
A. Glassman - Yes

Motion passes 5-0

7. CASE #23-15: Request by applicant for Modification of Site Plan Approval of Case #35-14, for a revision of building layout, and parking and loading design, located at 2301 Purchase Street (Map

97, Lots 9, 151, 152, 153, 176 & 180) in the Industrial A and Industrial B zoning districts. Applicant's agent: Site Design Engineering, LLC, 11 Cushman Street, Middleboro, MA 02346.

Thomas Hardman, of Site Design Engineering 11 Cushman Street Middleboro, representing Sid Wainer. He introduced those in attendance for this petition.

Mr. Hardman stated the board had previously approved the site plan on this project as well as an extension. He stated some required changes were made in consultation with the planning office staff, resulting in this evening's request for site plan modification.

Mr. Hardman discussed the four changes in the modification. He indicated the "bump out" on the building which is being eliminated.

He indicated a fill on one portion of building resulting in one straight building line. He indicated the addition of a piece of building that will act as a tote wash down area. He then indicated the addition of four loading bays on the southeast corner.

Mr. Hardman stated these changes resulted in some modifications to the parking, which for the most part remains unchanged. He displayed the current proposed changes, which show the one additional parking space. He stated parking requirements were 149 and there are 263.

Mr. Hardman stated that all DPI changes were made and are reflected in this evening's plan, i.e. crosswalks, aisle widths, et cetera. He stated that Sid Wainer & Son are very excited about the project and eager to get it going. He noted that lot coverage and zoning table may have been inadvertently missed in the submission and he assured the board he would provide it. He stated lot coverage proposed is 42.5% with more than adequate parking.

Ms. Duff confirmed that the accommodated DPI list was the one dated September 9, 2014, Items 1-20. Ms. Duff asked how the one would access and egress the northwest parking area. Mr. Hardman indicated where the handicap access ramp would be located, along with the area of exclusive ADA parking. He stated the egress would be to back out, but not with a 90 degree turn, as the applicant was a bit tight on space. He stated the alternative would be to take the handicap spaces out of that area close to the building.

Mr. Cruz inquired as to any changes in the drainage. Mr. Hardman stated the drainage was the same, just the building footprint had changed.

A motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to open the public hearing.
Motion passed unopposed.

In response to Ms. Dawicki's invitation to speak or be recorded in favor of the application, Councilor Henry Bousquet stated he was in favor of the project. He noted the company had been in New Bedford for 100 years. He stated the company does right by the community and works hard to take care of their employees. He stated that as a chef he has worked with the company for twenty years and has never had a bad thing to say. He stated the company has integrity and when they say they will do something they will. He stated they are a great asset to New Bedford and he welcomes their expansion in our city.

In response to Ms. Dawicki's invitation to speak or be recorded in favor of the application, Councilor David

Alves stated he was proud to stand in support of the project. He stated the company had been outstanding to New Bedford. He stated he had always been impressed with the caliber of business and effort they put into our community, by hiring a number of people. He stated the company has customers up and down the east coast and they could move anywhere and communities would be proud to have them. He stated he was happy to see that not only are they willing to stay in New Bedford, but to expand in New Bedford. He stated he had never heard a complaint about the company. He stated they support a number of community events, specifically the zoo. He stated these are minor changes to an approved plan which they have improved. He stated they had not only met all the recommendations and requirements, they have actually exceeded them. He stated he stands supports their efforts and would hate to see a company like this be disappointed by anything the city does, as they have never disappointed the city. He looks for a favorable recommendation.

In response to Ms. Dawicki's invitation to speak or be recorded in favor of the application, Councilor Linda Morad stated she wished to thank the board for its approval of the prior plan. She stated it is a great plan and the city has worked closely with the company. She stated the company plays by the rules and made the changes suggested by the planning department to make the project a good one and comply with all city rules and regulations. She stated it is a strong and growing company in the city of New Bedford that she would like to see stay here. She hopes the board will act favorably.

There was response no to Ms. Dawicki's further invitation to speak or be recorded in favor.

She stated they had received letters of support from City Councilors not in attendance this evening, which she read into the record.

There was no response to Ms. Dawicki's invitation to speak or be recorded in opposition.

A motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to close the public hearing.
Motion passed unopposed.

There being no questions from the board, a motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to approve the modification of site plan approval for Case #23-15 for building Sid Wainer & Sons, located on Purchase Street (Plot 97, Lots 9, 151-153, 154- 156, 176 & 180)
Motion passed unopposed (5-0)

8. Case # 29-13: Request by applicant for an extension for a Site Plan Review approved on October 23rd, 2013 for a Mixed Use project containing a Hotel, Restaurant and Residential Dwelling Units at the Candleworks Building located at 72 North Water Street (Plot 53, Lots 68 & 291), in the Mixed Use Business and Bedford Landing Waterfront Historical zoning districts. Applicant's agent: Michael A. Kehoe, Esq., Partridge, Snow, & Hahn, LLP, 128 Union Street, Suite 500, New Bedford, MA 02740.

Michael Kehoe, 128 Union Street, New Bedford, stated there is ongoing litigation in Bristol County Superior Court of an abutter's appeal which has not yet been resolved. He stated in spite of the status of casino project, the applicant is undeterred and wants to go forward with the hotel project. He stated he is therefore respectfully requesting an extension on site plan review approval.

Mr. Glassman confirmed that nothing had changed since the granting of a request for extension last year. With

that he stated he felt it was pretty basic.

Ms. Duff expressed that she was not aware the case was still being held up in court. Mr. Kehoe stated his research showed it was still an active case in superior court.

A motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to open the public hearing.
Motion passed unopposed.

There was response no to Ms. Dawicki's invitation to speak or be recorded in favor.
There was no response to Ms. Dawicki's invitation to speak or be recorded in opposition

A motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to close the public hearing.
Motion passed unopposed.

A motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to extend site plan review approval for Case #29-13.
Motion passed unopposed. (5-0)

9. Case # 33-13: Request by applicant for an extension for a Special Permit Review approved November 27th, 2013 for a reduction of the minimum off-street parking requirement for a Mixed-Use project (Restaurant and Office) at the Candleworks Building located at 72 North Water Street (Plot 53, Lots 68 & 291), in the Mixed Use Business and Bedford Landing Waterfront Historical zoning districts. Applicant's agent: Michael A. Kehoe, Esq., Partridge, Snow, & Hahn, LLP, 128 Union Street, Suite 500, New Bedford, MA 02740.

Michael Kehoe, 128 Union Street, New Bedford, stated this matter has the same issues as the previous case. He stated this was a special permit reducing parking conditioned upon the applicant obtaining offsite parking. He stated they intended to lease Elm Street Garage spaces, which had 900 available spaces of which they needed some 400. He stated this and the previous case really go together, being one project with different issues.

Ms. Clarke clarified that the extension being discussed on both cases is for one year. Mr. Kehoe confirmed and noted this matter had also received a previous extension.

A motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to open the public hearing.
Motion passed unopposed.

There was response no to Ms. Dawicki's invitation to speak or be recorded in favor.
There was no response to Ms. Dawicki's invitation to speak or be recorded in opposition

A motion was made (PC) and seconded (AG) to close the public hearing.
Motion passed unopposed.

A motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to extend the permit for one year for Case #33-13.
Motion passed unopposed. (5-0)

Continued Public Hearings: No Continued Cases Presented.

Old/New Business:

10. Ms. Clarke informed the board they had received an environmental notification form for a project on Fish Island. She gave the planning board an update on ordinances. She mentioned first and foremost the form based code. She stated after a series of public charrettes over the summer, in an effort to get public comment in and public information out, the project is moving ahead on schedule and they hope to present a draft before the end of the year.
11. Ms. Clarke stated that the sign ordinance, which has been in development for quite some time, to work in tandem with the form based zoning changes. She stated they have a draft of the sign ordinance, but they are seeking to do better and provide an ordinance that will work with the form based code in the future. She stated they code itself won't substantially change but they are seeking to have it flow together with the ordinance. She stated the proposed draft has already undergone significant internal review, along with Councilors Lopes and Morad, the city solicitor, and the Commissioner of Inspectional services; the planning staff having worked in great detail going over every piece of the ordinance. She stated they are looking to present something of a high quality example, so that is of great ease of use for the public and for the enforcement by administration.
12. Ms. Clarke stated the café ordinance has been reviewed and in the process of being sent to the city solicitors office for a hearing review. The Transit Oriented Development Overlay District is the city solicitors' office for review.
13. Ms. Clarke informed the board that as this meeting was being held, there was also a Waterfront Planning meeting being held.
14. Ms. Clarke noted for the board that the planning department is going to take board training to bring everyone along; zoning board, historic commission and planning board. She stated they are looking at training in the spring. She stated in the meantime, they are free workshops with great information and opportunity for planning commissioners.
15. Ms. Duff inquired as to the status of the search for City Planner, to replace Ms. Maclean. Ms. Clarke provided the same, listing for Ms. Duff the ads outlets where the position has been posted, and she stated they are hopeful they will receive many highly qualified applicants.
16. Ms. Dawicki stated she liked the staff comments the board is receiving and their linking to the master plan. She suggested reviving the five year old master plan in some way.

Ms. Clarke stated that though the office is in a transitional phase at this time, when the opportunity presents itself to do something constructive and become more proactive, they want to take advantage of it, believing these to be living documents. She affirmed Ms. Dawicki's input and welcomed additional input in the future.

Ms. Duff stated it would be great to get collaboration between the boards and commission to harness the collective knowledge.

Ms. Clarke assured her that whenever possible that will be done.

Ms. Dawicki indicated she looked forward to seeing the planning staff involved in the Waterfront planning project.

Ms. Dawicki suggested they take advantage of the opportunity to do something over time, addressing it when there are lighter agendas by looking at Master Plan goals and objectives.

Adjourned at 7:43 p.m. A motion was made (KD) and seconded (AG) to adjourn.
Motion passed unopposed.

Date of Next Meeting: November 4, 2015