

Arlington Redevelopment Board
Monday, December 2, 2024, at 7:30 PM
Community Center, Main Hall
27 Maple Street, Arlington, MA 02476
Meeting Minutes

This meeting was recorded by ACMi.

PRESENT: Rachel Zsembery (Chair), Eugene Benson, Shaina Korman-Houston, Kin Lau, Stephen Revilak

STAFF: Claire Ricker, Director of Planning and Community Development; Sarah Suarez, Assistant Director of Planning and Community Development

The Chair called the meeting of the Board to order.

The Chair opened with **Agenda Item 1 – Review Meeting Minutes**

November 18, 2024, minutes – The Board members made no changes to the draft minutes. The Chair requested a motion to approve the minutes as submitted. Mr. Lau so moved, Mr. Benson seconded, and the Board voted 4-0 in favor. Ms. Korman-Houston abstained.

The Chair moved to **Agenda Item 2 – 2025 Meeting Schedule**

The Chair noted that Board members are still making summer travel plans, so the Board will need revisit those dates at a future date. With that caveat, she asked for a motion to approve the 2025 Meeting Schedule as proposed. Mr. Lau so moved, Mr. Benson seconded, and the Board voted unanimously in favor.

The Chair moved to **Agenda Item 3 – Public Hearing: Docket #3810, 149 Pleasant Street**

The Chair explained that this is a continuation of the hearing begun on August 5, 2024. Ms. Ricker said that the applicant submitted revised plans and additional materials requested by the Board.

The applicant was represented by architect Martha Penzenik and developer Jim Mackey. Ms. Penzenik explained that the street tree that they would like to remove in order to build a driveway is diseased. Both the Tree Warden and an arborist said that it is affected by the apple tree borer, which is deadly to small trees and potentially a danger to other trees in the area. The Select Board approved their request to remove the tree and plant two new street trees on either side of the driveway. Select Board member Mr. Hurd suggested that instead of planting new crabapple trees, they plant a species of tree that would grow to become a larger shade tree, which the applicant is happy to do.

Ms. Penzenik said that because it is an all-electric new home, the requirement for solar is not triggered, as stated in a letter from the Inspectional Services Department.

Ms. Penzenik also said that they have a letter from the Historic Districts Commission (AHDC) stating that they would like the project to have two separate driveways and parking areas. She noted that the Board asked to see a drawing with just one driveway which included the three required parking spaces not in the required setback, but she said that there is no way to include three parking spaces without any of them being in the setback.

Ms. Penzenik said that the submitted materials also include the model of heat pump they intend to use.

Ms. Penzenik drew the Board's attention to the site plan drawing in the packet provided. She explained that they have increased the width of the landscaped barrier between the upper parking and the neighboring property to two feet wide. The upper two required parking spaces are not in the setback. The upper two units will have an area for trash and recycling on either side of the stairs leading down from the parking area. The lower unit's trash and recycling area is at the end of its driveway. The heat pump units for the upper units are on either side of those units' decks, and the heat pump for the lower unit is located on the north side of the building. The accessible parking space for the lower unit

slightly overlaps with the setback, because it is a large spot for an accessible vehicle. The first drawing shows the straight driveway they hope to build, with the two street trees they intend to plant on either side. The second drawing shows a curved driveway that would go around the existing street tree. With a straight driveway, the distance from the edge of the driveway to the center of the intersection is 73 feet, and with a curved driveway, the distance is 80 feet, either of which is sufficient.

Ms. Penzenik said that the engineering site plan shows a cross-section of the wall to be built alongside the upper parking area. Mr. Mackey said that it is a typical poured-concrete wall.

Mr. Revilak asked if the accessible unit has laundry facilities. Mr. Mackey said that the interior of the unit has not been finalized, but it will definitely include laundry facilities. Mr. Revilak also said that he prefers the site plan with the straight driveway.

Mr. Benson said that he spoke to Mike Ciampa about the solar requirement, and he thinks that the applicants misunderstood the letter that Mr. Ciampa provided. Mr. Ciampa told Mr. Benson that in his letter to the applicant, he was talking about the building code, not the zoning bylaw. There are two separate requirements for solar – one under the building code (specifically the new stretch code), which is only triggered if a building is not all-electric, and a separate requirement in the zoning bylaw. The fact that the building will be all-electric and therefore not required to include solar under the stretch code does not exempt the applicant from the requirement in the zoning bylaw. It is possible that the proposal meets one of the exemptions in the zoning bylaw, but the applicant has not provided materials to indicate that. One such exemption could be a denial from the AHDC, but the applicant would need to actually present a proposal with the latest solar technology to the AHDC. The AHDC has generally not approved solar panels that are visible from the street, but probably their objection has been to raised panels that stick out from the roof. It is now possible to get solar panels that look like roof tiles, which the AHDC might be willing to approve. The zoning bylaw includes other possible solar exemptions which the applicant could consider, but they would also need to provide documentation for any of those exemptions.

Mr. Benson said that he would be fine with either the straight or curved driveway. He also noted that while the drawings were updated to indicate three rather than six parking spaces, the application itself was not updated and still indicates six parking spaces.

Mr. Benson noted that the zoning bylaw requires a street tree every 25 feet. The drawings indicate the inclusion of street trees that meet that requirement on Pleasant Street, but not on Gray Street. He thinks that they will need to plant two or three streets to meet the requirement. Ms. Penzenik said that visibility on Gray Street as it approaches Pleasant Street is already difficult, and she is concerned about adding trees that could further impede visibility. Mr. Benson said that the rules prohibit bushes near an intersection for that reason, but they do not mention taller trees, which he thinks will not pose a problem.

Mr. Benson said that the Board received a letter questioning why the Board would waive the usable open space requirement, suggesting that the applicant could flatten out the area in front of the proposed building to give it a grade of less than 8%, enabling them to meet the usable open space requirements. Mr. Mackey said that the grade in front of the house is very steep, and flattening it would require building retaining walls, which the AHDC did not want them to do. The Chair noted that the Board generally prefers maintaining the natural grade rather than flattening it.

Ms. Korman-Houston asked if the accessible unit has a second means of egress. Ms. Penzenik said that there is a well in the back that provides egress.

Ms. Korman-Houston noted that the East Elevation appears to show a lower door on the left side, next to the retaining wall and asked what that was. Ms. Penzenik replied that it is actually a basement window, not a door.

Mr. Lau said that he prefers the curved driveway because it moves the driveway slightly further from the intersection, which he thinks is safer, but he does not feel strongly either way.

Mr. Lau noted that the plan showing the third floor shows that each of the upper units has a room with a closet and bathroom, but the main room is not labeled. Ms. Penzenik said that they did not label those rooms because they could be used for a variety of purposes – as a bedroom, an office, a play room, etc. Mr. Mackey noted that the windows are designed to meet the egress requirements of bedroom windows. Mr. Lau said that they should be labeled as bedrooms,

even if they could be used for other purposes. That would make each of the upper units four-bedroom units. The applicant said that they could relabel that drawing.

The Chair summarized the findings that the Board would need to make in order to approve the application:

- Section 3.4.4.F, Utility Service – to find that utilities do not need to be run underground.
- Section 5.4.3, Use Regulations for Residential Districts – a three-family building in the R4 district requires a Special Permit.
- Section 6.1.10, Location of Parking Spaces – to allow for a second driveway, and to allow one of the parking spaces to be partially in the setback.
- Open Space, Usable
- Solar Requirement

The Chair opened the floor to public comment:

- Susan Stamps, representing the Tree Committee – She said that the narrative addendum submitted by the applicant does not indicate who wrote the section relating to the crabapple tree that they are proposing to remove, so it is not clear if it was written by an arborist. The Tree Committee spoke to the Tree Warden today, and he said that the tree is healthy, which is why a hearing in front of the Select Board was necessary. Assuming that the tree is healthy, the Tree Committee would like it to remain. The curved driveway that would not require the removal of the tree is similar to a driveway shown in one of the photographs of nearby houses submitted by the applicant. She noted that the Select Board's decision was that the applicant may not remove the tree unless required by the plan approved by the Redevelopment Board. She asked the Board to make the applicant aware that they are required not only to plant street trees, but also to maintain and water them for the first three years after planning.

Seeing no one else who wished to speak, the Chair closed public comment.

Mr. Benson said that he thinks there are advantages and disadvantages to both the straight and curved driveway proposals, and he would accept either. He is fine with granting relief for the corner of the accessible parking space in the setback. He is also willing to grant relief for the second driveway. He is somewhat concerned about the safety of cars backing out of the upper driveway onto Gray Street, but he is willing to grant relief and leave the details to Inspectional Services. He would like the Board to require that the stormwater plan be approved by the Department of Public Works. He is not inclined to grant relief of the solar requirement under the zoning bylaw; he would like them to either propose a solar plan that meets the requirements or come back with material showing that they meet one of the exemptions in the zoning bylaw.

The Chair asked the applicant about the evaluation of the tree and who made the assessment. Mr. Mackey said that he talked to the Tree Warden and an arborist. They did not say that the tree was diseased, but they said that it could be. An arborist did not say that there were borer beetles in the tree. Mr. Mackey also noted that the curved driveway might make it more difficult for a large vehicle, such as an ambulance or a transport van, to pull in, which is especially problematic given that the lower unit is designed to be accessible and may be used by someone elderly or with a disability. The only purpose of the curved driveway is to save the tree, but if they take the tree down, they intend to plant two trees which will grow larger and provide more effective shade.

The Chair noted that the trash and recycling areas for the upper units appear to be at a lower level than the parking. She asked if the resident would then need to carry the trash and recycling bins up the stairs to the driveway in order to wheel them to the street. Mr. Mackey said that they would need to do so, but those areas could be relocated to the top of the stairs, on the level of the driveway. Either way, the residents would have to carry their trash and recycling up the stairs, either in bags to take to the bins, or in the bins themselves. If those areas are moved to the top of the stairs, they would not be in enclosures, and they would be visible from the street. The AHDC wanted them out of the way and enclosed. The Chair asked them to consider moving them, given the difficulty of carrying full bins up the stairs.

The Chair noted that the drawings do not show any sort of walkway from the decks at the back to the stairway leading to the driveway onto Gray Street. Mr. Mackey said that they intend to create stone walkways, as well as hardscaping in front of the trash and recycling, in order to enable residents to pull the bins out. Ms. Penzenik proposed putting the enclosures on the north side of the house, enabling the residents to take the bins to Pleasant, rather than Gray Street. The Chair noted that if it is too difficult for residents to get the bins in and out and up the stairs, they might choose not

to use the enclosures but to put the trash bins directly on the driveway, which defeats the purpose of the AHDC asking that they be enclosed and out of sight.

Mr. Lau said that the outstanding issues are solar, trash/recycling placement, straight versus curved driveway, and labeling the third-floor rooms as bedrooms. He would like to make those issues subject to administrative approval rather than continuing the hearing and requiring them to come back to a third Board meeting. The most difficult issue is the solar requirement. The Chair said that they could potentially craft a motion that would allow for that. Mr. Revilak said that he would prefer that the applicants also not be required to return to the AHDC, which seems unlikely to approve a plan that would involve solar on the portions of the roof facing Pleasant Street or Gray Street. Mr. Benson said that he thinks the only portion of the roof that would get enough sunlight to make solar possible is the side facing Pleasant Street, but he also thinks that the AHDC might approve the newer style of solar panels that look like roof tiles even if they are visible from the street. He also noted that there is a form regarding solar that must be completed according to the Board's Rules and Regulations. He would be willing to vote for administrative review, but he would like the Board to delegate him to work with DPCD on the issue of the solar requirement. Mr. Lau noted that another possible exemption to the solar requirement would be to show that the roof is too shaded for solar panels to be effective. Given that they are saving the three pine trees on the site and proposing to plant multiple new street trees on Pleasant and Gray Streets, they may be able to show that the roof will not get enough sun.

Ms. Korman-Houston said that if the crabapple tree is healthy, she would prefer saving the tree and requiring the curved driveway. However, the information that has been presented about the health of the tree is not clear. If that issue is going to be left to administrative review, she would like to make sure that clearer information is provided to DPCD about the health of the tree. The Chair asked about the size of the tree, and Mr. Mackey said it is about 4 inches. He said that from a safety perspective, a straight driveway is better. He does not think it makes sense to require a curved driveway to save a 4-inch tree, especially given that they intend to plant two new trees that will be larger and provide more shade, in place of the one tree currently in place. The Chair said that she thinks the straight driveway is preferable. Mr. Revilak agreed, especially given that they are proposing two trees of a larger species in the crabapple tree's place. The other Board members agreed.

The Chair summarized the proposed findings for the special permit:

- Under Section 3.4.4, the Board provides relief from the requirement to place the utility services underground.
- Under Section 5.4.3, the Board finds that a three-family structure is an appropriate use for this location.
- Under Section 6.1.10, the Board provides relief for a second driveway.
- Under Section 5.3.16, the Board provides relief for the accessible parking space in the driveway from Pleasant Street to overlap the Gray Street setback, and for the parking spaces in the driveway from Gray Street to overlap the setback from the adjoining lot.
- Under Section 2, Definitions – Open Space, Usable, the Board provides relief for usable open space due to the desire to retain the existing grading of the lot to the extent possible.

The Chair summarized the proposed special conditions for the special permit:

- The designated parking spaces are limited to three.
- The applicant must replace the existing crabapple street tree on Pleasant Street with two new street trees, in accordance with the finding from the Select Board.
- The applicant must plant a street tree every 25 feet on Gray Street, per the zoning bylaw.
- The Board finds that the straight driveway is preferred over the curved driveway.
- The applicant must label the third-floor rooms in the two upper units as bedrooms.
- The applicant must work with DPCD and Mr. Benson for administrative review, to determine whether the application conforms to the solar bylaw requirements in Zoning Bylaw Section 6.4, or whether the project meets the exemptions as delineated in Section 6.4.2.
- The applicant must work with DPCD for administrative review of the location of trash and recycling enclosures for the two upper units, to determine that the location of the enclosures does not require the residents to carry bins up and down the stairs.

The Chair asked for a motion to approve Docket 3810, 149 Pleasant Street, with the findings and special conditions as previously detailed. Mr. Lau so moved, Mr. Benson seconded, and the Board voted unanimously in approval.

The Chair moved to **Agenda Item 4 – Public Hearing: Docket #3821, 1513-1515 and 1517-1519 Massachusetts Avenue**

The Chair explained that this is a continuation of the hearing begun on October 21, 2024. Ms. Ricker said that the applicant submitted revised plans and supplemental materials for a significantly smaller building as requested by the Board. The proposal is now for a building with five residential units, including one accessible unit, and one commercial unit. The applicant is requesting relief from the twenty-foot front setback requirement in order to bring the development closer to the sidewalk, which is desirable for a mixed-use development.

The applicants were represented by attorney Matt Eckel and owners Ilya Zvenigorodskiy and Gene Bernshtein from IG Investments. Mr. Eckel explained that they are presenting a scaled down application due to the fact that the Board is unable to grant relief on Floor Area Ratio (FAR), so they have reduced the FAR from 1.57 to 0.75. They considered changing it to a purely residential project, but they felt that a mixed-use development was more appropriate for this location. They have incorporated the Board's feedback about several issues into the revised design. They reduced the number of residential units from nine to five, and the height of the building from three stories to two. The rear setback was increased to twenty feet. They did consider a compliant dimensional setback on all four sides, but having the front façade closer to the sidewalk would be more affective in engaging the streetscape than having it set back twenty feet, so they are requesting relief from the front setback requirement. They redesigned the building and front façade to make the commercial use more prominent in order to engage the streetscape. They redesigned the rear of the building to reflect the look of the front façade. They also increased the side setbacks. They increased the total open space to about 60%, considerably in excess of the requirement. The only other relief they seek would be to keep the utilities above-ground.

All five residential units are proposed to have two bedrooms, and they average around 950 square feet. They all have individual deck or patio space, as well as access to communal open space in the rear. The commercial space is just under 1,000 square feet and is prominently located on the first floor. The driveway is located at the far left with five parking spaces, one of which is accessible. The front residential entry is in the center left, and the commercial entry is to the right. The design incorporates recessed areas to break up the façade. The commercial space takes up about half the front façade, but the design of the façade continues across the whole first floor, including in front of the parking area, which is open on the side and rear. The residential entry opens to a hallway leading to Unit 1, as well as a stairwell leading to the upper four units. Between Unit 1 and the parking area are 8 long-term bicycle parking spaces. The rear area includes a variety of trees as well as a picnic area and a garden area. The second floor contains four two-bedroom units. They all have recessed decks, private laundry facilities, and two bathrooms. There will be windows all along the first floor of the front façade to create engagement with the street and let light into the commercial space. One of the windows looks into the sprinkler room, but they did not want to leave that section of wall blank, with no windows. They intend to plant four street trees along the 98 feet of frontage.

The Chair asked for clarification that the only relief the applicant is seeking is for the front setback, and Mr. Eckel confirmed that. She also asked if there is any existing commercial use on either of the lots currently, and Mr. Eckel said that there is not. She asked if the window looking into the sprinkler room will be filmed, and Mr. Eckel said that it would. She also noted that another of the windows looks into the parking area; Mr. Bernshtein said that they have not discussed what to do with that window, but they are open to filming it as well.

The Chair asked if they have plans for the location of signage for the commercial space. Mr. Bernshtein replied that they left it open because they wanted the Board's feedback, but he thinks it would make the most sense above the door to the commercial space. She asked if the vertical siding is a board and batten, and Mr. Bernshtein confirmed that it is. He also said that the recessed decks would have wood paneling.

Mr. Lau said that he is fine with granting relief for the front-yard setback; he thinks having the building close to the sidewalk is appropriate for the setting. He noted that in the recessed sections, the first-floor windows are higher than along the rest of the façade, which he thinks looks uneven. He would also like to see the location of a signage band. He also noted that the rear and side elevations are too tight; it looks like the second-floor windows go all the way to the floor. The drawings should show a horizontal band between the floors. The four bay windows on the front façade also appear to be floor to ceiling, with large trim around them, but the sliding doors in the recessed sections are considerably smaller, with much smaller trim, which makes them appear disproportionate.

Ms. Korman-Houston said that the commercial space does not read as commercial storefront. She noted that several items requested at the prior meeting were not provided. Mr. Eckel said that they do intend to provide those items, but since they had to wait for about a month to get feedback from Town Counsel on whether the Board could grant relief on the FAR, they did not have enough time to prepare everything. They wanted to present this general plan to the Board and get feedback about whether it would be possible for it to be approved, and then move forward with some of the other details.

Mr. Benson said that they still need to provide a LEED checklist and narrative. They also need to provide a solar energy system assessment as required in the Board's rules and regulations – an analysis for solar energy systems for the site detailing layout and annual production, the maximum feasible solar zone area, drawings showing the solar energy system proposed, a narrative describing the system and the reasons it was chosen, or a detailed explanation about why it meets an exemption.

Mr. Benson agrees that having the building close to the sidewalk is appropriate, but that creates a challenge for visibility for drivers pulling out of the driveway. He would like to see some sort of warning system or mirrors for safety.

Mr. Revilak asked if IG Investments is still planning to use the commercial space for their office, and Mr. Bernshtein confirmed that they are. He also asked if the residential units would be condominiums or apartments, and Mr. Bernshtein said that they intend to sell them as condominiums.

The Chair said that the façade does not clearly delineate the commercial space from the residential space. She also does not like the raised first-floor windows on the recessed areas. She noted that the proposal exceeds the required 60% fenestration requirement for mixed-use buildings, and she recommended removing the windows into the sprinkler room and garage and moving the recessed window in the commercial space down to the same level as the other windows. That would help the commercial space look like a commercial storefront and differentiate it from the other side of the building.

Mr. Lau said that the windows on the right side of the building are too high as compared to the windows on the front. Moving from the front to the side of the building, the placement of the windows should be better aligned. He recommended using some sort of framed lattice on the left side of the front façade rather than a glass window into the parking area. That would help clarify that one side is the garage and the other is the commercial space, while still linking the two sides architecturally.

Mr. Lau noted that they will also need to submit drawings showing where mechanical equipment as well as trash and recycling will go.

The Chair opened the floor to public comment:

- Susan Stamps, representing the Tree Committee – She said that she cannot tell from the drawings how many new trees they intend to plant. Mr. Zvenigorodskiy said that they are preserving one existing healthy tree, and they will submit a landscape plan with more details about the shrubs and trees to be planted. Ms. Stamps said that she would like to know that there will not be a net loss of trees.

Mr. Lau asked Ms. Stamps if the Tree Committee met and discussed the two projects that Ms. Stamps has commented on at this meeting. Ms. Stamps said that they did discuss the project discussed earlier at 149 Pleasant Street. They have not discussed this project, at 1513-1519 Mass Ave, but she stated that she knows that the rest of the committee would agree with what she is saying. Mr. Lau said that she cannot represent her comments as being from the Tree Committee unless they have actually discussed it.

Seeing no one else who wished to speak, the Chair closed public comment.

Mr. Revilak said that his expectation is that if comments are coming to the Board from another board or committee, that must be reflected in the agenda and minutes of that body. Otherwise, comments should be framed as being the opinion of the individual making them.

The Chair summarized the items that the Board would like the applicant to address for the next meeting:

- Consider the overall fenestration, specifically the commercial space versus the parking area on the first floor.
- Consider the openings to the parking area on the rear and left side of the building and include trim and detail to correctly show the opening.
- Provide a solar energy assessment in accordance with the requirements in the Zoning Bylaw and the Board's Rules and Regulations.
- Provide a LEED checklist and narrative.
- Provide a roof plan showing the location of mechanical equipment as well as venting from the interior units.
- Provide a landscape plan including street trees, other landscaping, grading, and how water will flow off the site.
- Provide a lighting plan.
- Provide information about a warning system for the driveway.
- Update the site plan to show trash and recycling locations.
- Provide updated drawings showing the location and size of commercial signage.
- Provide an updated stormwater plan.

The Chair asked for a motion to continue the hearing for Docket #3821 to Monday, January 13, 2025. Mr. Lau so moved, Mr. Benson seconded, and the Board voted unanimously in favor.

The Chair moved to **Agenda Item 5 – Open Forum**

The Chair opened the floor to public comment. Seeing no one who wished to speak, the Chair closed the floor.

The Chair moved to **Agenda Item 5 – New Business**

Ms. Ricker said that the Board has in the past used the second meeting of December to listen to proposals for citizen warrant articles to amend the zoning bylaw. She asked if the Board would like to do that again. The Chair said that she has always found it helpful to hear what ideas residents have and give them feedback to help them craft better warrant articles prior to the public hearing. The Board agreed. Ms. Ricker said she would work on outreach to let community members know.

Ms. Ricker reported that she, the Chair, and the Town's Economic Development Coordinator met to discuss the Arlington Heights Business District. Given the feedback received at the public meeting in October related to this issue, they decided that it would be prudent not to attempt to bring a warrant article to 2025 Annual Town Meeting, but rather to do more community outreach and solicit more feedback before crafting a warrant article. The Chair noted that some of the feedback at the public meeting pointed out that quite a few changes have occurred in the Heights since the original survey about this issue was conducted several years ago, and perhaps another survey should be conducted to get a clearer sense of the current needs. She thinks that it is important to ensure that the engagement is thoughtful and consistent. Mr. Revilak noted that the zoning in the Heights has changed in recent years, and if they were to use the dimensional regulations developed in 2019, it could result in down-zoning for much of the Heights, which is not what the Board wants. Mr. Benson noted that the Board made a commitment to bringing a plan to rezone the Heights to Town Meeting in 2025 and doing the same for East Arlington in 2026. He is disappointed at the thought that rezoning for both areas of Town would be pushed off for an additional year.

Mr. Benson noted that the Board has pointed out the limitations of the zoning of B1 Districts, which has affected a number of projects. He would like the Board to bring a warrant article to 2025 Town Meeting that reconsiders the requirements for those districts. Mr. Revilak expressed interest in the Board's doing that.

Mr. Revilak reported that the Select Board has reviewed the FY2025 Tax Rate Booklet. According to the booklet, Arlington's commercial base decreased in the last year from 5.34 to 5.27. Under the circumstances, and given the decrease in Boston, he thinks that decrease is not too bad. Arlington has \$225,000,000 in personal property assessments, but most of that is utilities; only about \$12,000,000 is property that you would normally see specifically in a business. Taking out utilities, the commercial base that actually comes from businesses is a little under 4%. The total assessment is \$15.4 billion, up from \$14.5 billion. Last year's new growth is around 1%, which is better than the previous year, but still below the state average.

Mr. Benson said that the Economic Development bill that the governor recently signed has a two-year permit extension provision in it, which he thinks affects permits issued by the Board, but he is not sure how. He would appreciate guidance from Town Counsel about how it impacts special permits issued by the Board, particularly the one permit extension recently granted by the Board.

The Chair noted that the permit extension mentioned by Mr. Benson required the applicant James Doherty to return to the Board every six months with an update on the project, and another such update is currently due. Ms. Ricker said that she has been in contact with Mr. Doherty and is working on scheduling him to attend the upcoming December 16 meeting.

The Chair asked for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Lau so moved, and Mr. Benson seconded. The Board voted and approved unanimously.

Meeting **Adjourned at 9:35 pm.**

Documents used:

- Agenda Item 1 November 18, 2024, Draft Minutes
- Agenda Item 2 Proposed 2025 Meeting Schedule
- Agenda Item 3 149 Pleasant St Drawings & Plans 11-20-2024
149 Pleasant St Narrative Addendum 11-20-2024
149 Pleasant St EDR Application 07-11-2024
149 Pleasant St Products
149 Pleasant St Stormwater Report 06-24-2024
AHDC Certificate of Appropriateness re 149 Pleasant St 03-21 2024
AHDC Letter re 149 Pleasant St 09-23-2024
EDR Memo Docket 3810 149 Pleasant 08-01-2024
Updated EDR Memo Docket 3810 149 Pleasant 11-26-2024
- Agenda Item 4 1513-1519 Mass Ave - Updated ARB Application
1513-1519 Mass Ave - Updated Drawings & Plans 11-27-2024
2024-11-27 Updated EDR memo - 1513-1519 Mass Ave
- Agenda Item 8 Correspondence re: 149 Pleasant St - 08302024 Lubar, K.
Correspondence re: 149 Pleasant St - 11262024 Aries, O.
Correspondence re: 149 Pleasant St - 11272024 Seltzer, D.
Correspondence re: 149 Pleasant St - 12022024 Lubar, K.
Correspondence re: 1513-1519 Mass Ave - 12012024 Seltzer, D.
Correspondence re: 1500 Mass Ave - 11182024 Seltzer, D