



TOWN OF
STONEHAM
MASSACHUSETTS

PLANNING BOARD
781-279-2695

STONEHAM PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

(in accordance with provision of M.G.L. c.30A, §§ 18-25)

Wednesday, May 14, 2025

Town Hall Hearing Room

7:00 PM

Members Present: Chair Frank Vallarelli, Vice Chair Kevin Dolan, Daniel Moynihan, Jr., Marcia Wengen and Brianna Kelly.

Also present at the meeting: Town Clerk Maria Sagarino acting as Clerk for the Planning Board, Attorney Charles Houghton, John Cullen, architect Daniel Skolski, engineer Rick Salvo, Attorney Kristine Hung, Jeremy Mazone of Mass Eye & Ear and Matthew Kilty.

The Chair brought the meeting to order at 7:01 PM in the Town Hall Hearing Room. Mr. Vallarelli welcomed new Associate Member Ellen McBride and introduced the members of the Board.

Minutes

Mr. Vallarelli accepted a motion from Ms. Wengen to approve the minutes for January 8, 2025 which was seconded by Mr. Dolan. Four members voted in favor of approval with one abstention by Mr. Moynihan 4-0-1.

Mr. Dolan made a motion to accept the minutes for April 9th with one correction. Ms. Kelly seconded the motion. All members voted in favor 5-0.

Mr. Dolan made a motion to approve the minutes for April 22, 2025 which was seconded by Mr. Moynihan. Four members voted in favor with one abstention 4-0-1.

Bond reduction for 62 High St/Isola Lane

DPW Brett Gonsalves updated the board on the progress of the roadway for the subdivision for Isola Lane. He stated that they had recently put a binder coat down. He indicated the order of things had been a bit different with this subdivision than what he'd like but that was due to the extensive drainage work needed to be done.

Mr. Vallarelli asked how much money was still being held. Mr. Gonsalves didn't have the figure in front of him but stated that there was more than enough as he had held 10% back with each reduction request.

Mr. Dolan made a motion to approve the bond reduction in the amount of \$97,299.36 as recommended by Mr. Gonsalves. Mr. Moynihan seconded the motion. All members voted in favor with Mr. Vallarelli abstaining due to his continued recusal on the matter.

Ms. Wengen had asked that the Approval Not Required Plan be taken out of order. Mr. Vallarelli entertained a motion from Ms. Wengen to move the item up which was seconded by Mr. Dolan. All members voted in favor.

Attorney Cicatelli explained that his clients on Arthur Street were giving a portion of their land to a neighbor on Summit Road. After going before the ZBA, two non-conforming lots have been reduced to one non-conforming lot. There is enough frontage. Satisfied with the plan, the Board proceeded to endorse the plan and all members signed each copy.

Mitigation Rules & Regulations

Mr. Gonsalves had previously provided the Board with a draft of mitigation rules and regulations back in January. Mr. Gonsalves had given them a brief explanation at that time. He made a few corrections and presented the document to the Board to once again have a discussion. He explained that these regulations were modelled after those adopted by a community that he had previously worked in. This other community had put these in place in 2001 for commercial development to allow for project mitigation in the area. This mitigation assists in minimizing the impacts to the municipality. It can help a community pay for infrastructure. These rules and regulations do not include residential subdivisions. They are handled by the subdivision rules and regulations.

Mr. Gonsalves gave an example. When 95 Maple Street, a 271 unit apartment building, was developed they got about 100-150 feet of sidewalk. He explained that with a mitigation agreement he'd be looking to get the entire street paved and maybe granite curbing. They can agree to do the work or provide a fee in lieu of that that would go into a dedicated fund to paid out for improvements needed in that specific project area. When the developer comes in, they are asked to adhere to the regulations but cannot be forced. Mr. Gonsalves did not see it as a hindrance to development in Town, but as a benefit to the community. Taking these monies allows for improving an area, maybe with upgrading the light signals or improving the infrastructure. These rules would provide guidance to the Board and give them a mechanism by which to ask that work be done or money given for future improvements.

Mr. Dolan asked if it can be applied to mixed use. Mr. Gonsalves responded that it would apply to mixed use. Mr. Dolan also asked if parts could be waived to create flexibility. Mr. Gonsalves stated that could be done but cautioned against doing so. Mr. Vallarelli mentioned that there was mitigation for Fallon Rd and questioned if Marjam was redeveloped if we would take more mitigation for the area. Mr. Gonsalves explained that you wouldn't want to negate your ability to receive mitigation because you don't know what might come up with the project in the future even if another developer has paid mitigation for an area. He gave an example with future development at Fallon Road. The pump station in that area is going to need an upgrade to the tune of over \$1 million. Mitigation from future development could help fund an upgrade to the pump station.

Mr. Gonsalves also explained that the developer would present a development impact statement which includes report of traffic impact and water & sewer. Mr. Dolan asked how much of a percentage the mitigation would be. Mr. Gonsalves stated that the mitigation would be 3% of the total project cost. Mr. Dolan asked how the amount is verified. Mr. Gonsalves said that the developers are usually presenting a pretty accurate number. Mr. Dolan agreed that would probably be the case especially with seeking financing. Mr. Moynihan asked about the applicability. Is it any new construction? Mr. Gonsalves repeated that it does not include residential. Mr. Moynihan asked where these regulations would be recorded. Ms. Sagarino responded that they would be placed in the Town Code, Chapter 17 Planning Board. It would be labelled as “Rules and Regulations” to differentiate it from a bylaw adopted at Town Meeting. The adoption would occur by a vote of the Planning Board.

Ms. Kelly wondered if the plans were modified and if the cost of the project changed how that would be addressed. Mr. Gonsalves believed the mitigation amount could be adjusted but he’d look into it. Ms. Wengen asked about the 3%. Could the developer just take care of it? Mr. Gonsalves stated they can complete that amount of work or they can give the Town the money to perform work.

Mr. Gonsalves explained the value in having these rules and regulations in place. He uses the 271 unit development at 95 Maple Street as an example. The Town got about 150 feet of sidewalk. He probably would have had them pave Maple Street and install granite curbing.

Mr. Moynihan asked how long money would stay in the account. Mr. Gonsalves would need to check on that but believed it would stay in the account until it could be utilized with a nexus to the project area.

Mr. Vallarelli mentioned Marjam project cost could be \$100 million and what would happen if three parcels were developed. Mr. Gonsalves indicated that not every project would meet the threshold. He looks forward to the Board comments and coming back to a future meeting.

134 Elm Street

Mr. Vallarelli read the legal notice for 134 Elm Street into the record as follows:

“You are hereby notified that the Stoneham Planning Board, acting as Special Permit Granting Authority, will hold a Public Hearing Wednesday evening, May 14, 2025 in the Hearing Room, Town Hall at 7:00 p.m. to hear all persons interested in a petition for a special permit pursuant to Section 4.3.3.1 by John Cullen of 8 Homestead Lane, Stoneham, Massachusetts to demolish the existing buildings and to construct two six unit Town House buildings at 134 Elm Street, Stoneham, MA. Petitioner is also requesting a special permit pursuant to Section 6.12.4.2 (a) and Section 6.12.5.1 (c) to allow a payment of a fee in lieu of affordable units to the Town of Stoneham Affordable Housing Trust Fund and/or to modify the number of affordable units required by Section 6.12.5.1 (a). A plan by PJF and Associates entitled “Existing conditions Site Plan of 134 Elm Street in Stoneham, MA” dated April 15, 2025 may be seen daily except Friday afternoon in the office of the Town Clerk”.

Mr. Dolan explains that this is before the Board under section 4.3.31 as the petitioner is requesting more than two units in Residence B.

Attorney Houghton explained the history behind this project that they have been talking about for two years. They went to Town Meeting to rezone the property to Residence B. The parcel is 45,000 square feet. After Planning Board they will go to Stormwater Board and Site Plan. Mr. Houghton stated these townhomes would be geared toward Stoneham residents who might want to sell their larger house and buy a unit near the Council on Aging.

Mr. Houghton believed each unit would be about \$900,000 to build and they'd sell for about \$950,000 which does not allow for much profit. He adds that the Board would like to see home ownership and this is home ownership.

Mr. Houghton explained that they were granted a sewer easement to connect in between this property and the Senior Center to avoid digging up Elm Street which is newly paved. A \$20,000 donation was made to the Town for this opportunity. There will be two buildings with six townhomes each with a ten foot strip in between. Mr. Moynihan didn't remember this design. He thought they might be freestanding townhouses. Mr. Dolan stated that you'd never fit twelve freestanding units.

Mr. Houghton spoke to the affordable units and the second Special Permit being requested. They would like to buyout one of the affordable units by paying a fee of \$140,000 in lieu of building one affordable unit. They are also seeking to waive the second affordable unit and making a \$60,000 donation to the Senior Center for much needed repairs. Mr. Houghton explained that the Town is in safe harbor. There are 120 units over the 10% required thanks to the Residences at Spot Pond.

Mr. Vallarelli read the department comments into the record from Police, Fire, Building and the Director of Planning. Mr. Houghton agreed to all comments and commented that there is a fire hydrant out front on Elm Street but they would add another. He also commented that the engineer stated the Fire truck turn will work.

Ms. Kelly asked about the \$60,000 donation to the senior center. Mr. Houghton responded that they are requesting to pay \$140,000 as a fee in lieu of building the first affordable unit and would like the second unit waived with a \$60,000 donation being given to the Senior Center.

Mr. Moynihan asked Mr. Houghton to speak to section 6.12.5.1 (c) and the conditions of the waiver. Mr. Moynihan thought that it sounded like the requirements for a variance. Mr. Houghton spoke to the uniqueness of the site being right next to the senior center. It will be a better project but the affordable component of paying \$140,000 for a fee in lieu of adversely affects the project.

Ms. Kelly asked about the buyout going to the Municipal Affordable Housing Trust and asked what the money can be spent on. Ms. Sagarino emailed the Board a copy of the bylaw and a Municipal Affordable Housing Trust guidebook. Ms. Kelly thought that marketing an affordable unit would benefit the community.

Priscilla Gottwald of 106 Elm Street asked how big the units would be. John Cullen responded that they would be two bedrooms around 2100 square feet.

Mr. Houghton went over the criteria for section 4.3.3.1 (a)-(e) and indicated that all requirements are met with this project.

Mr. Dolan asked if guest parking is provided. Mr. Houghton responded that the parking requirement is 1.7 spaces per unit. With one space in front and one in garage, there are extra spaces. Mr. Cullen indicated that there are three visitor spots on the right side of the driveway. They are parallel spaces.

Ms. Wengen asked if Mr. Cullen owned the property yet. Mr. Houghton responded that there is a purchase & sale agreement in place and the sale will go through if all of the approvals are received. Ms. Wengen asked about the timeline. Mr. Houghton indicated that with Stormwater and Site Plan they were looking at October to start.

Mr. Dolan asked about the siding material. Mr. Cullen stated that it will be vinyl. Mr. Dolan asked if everything would be vinyl. Mr. Cullen mentioned that they would use a plastic wood type of material in spots. Ms. Wengen asked if the windows could be matched to the senior Center. She asked if there would be lighting in the driveway, also commenting that it is very dark at night. Mr. Houghton responded that there would be lighting.

Mr. Dolan indicated that the Board would want design review due to the bare bones rendering provided as they have in the past. Mr. Houghton and Mr. Cullen were fine with that condition.

Ms. Wengen spoke about the repair list provided by the Senior Center. The power washing, painting and priming will probably take up most of the \$60,000. They may not accomplish much of the list.

Ms. McBride asked what would happen if they do not receive a waiver for the second affordable unit. Other members responded that they would have to build an affordable unit. Mr. Houghton indicated that they'd have to think about how to proceed. The affordable units are almost a deal breaker because they are sold at a much lower price than the build cost.

With no further comment from the public, Mr. Moynihan made a motion to close the public hearing which was seconded by Mr. Dolan. All members voted in favor of closing the hearing 5-0.

Ms. Kelly was unsure about moving forward and asked if this could be tabled and brought back at the next meeting. She wanted to better understand the affordable housing trust. She also questioned the amount of the donation for the waiver. Mr. Moynihan asked if it was because \$80,000 appears to be left on the table [as the difference between the donation and the fee in lieu of]. Mr. Dolan stated that they have already closed the public hearing. Mr. Vallarelli added that the \$140,000 goes to the affordable housing trust and the Planning Board has no say in how the money is spent so it doesn't matter. Ms. Kelly acquiesced to the Board's wish to move forward with a vote.

Ms. Kelly made a motion to approve the Special Permit for 4.3.3.1. Mr. Dolan added that the ZBA decision, all department comments and design review be incorporated. Mr. Dolan and Mr. Moynihan seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. All members voted in favor 5-0.

Mr. Moynihan made a motion to approve the second Special Permit for 6.12.4.2 (a) to allow for a \$140,000 payment to the municipal affordable housing trust as a fee in lieu of building one affordable unit. He reluctantly added approval of 6.12.5.1 (c) to grant a waiver of the second affordable unit while accepting a donation for the Stoneham Senior Center in the amount of \$60,000. Mr. Moynihan stated that the site sits next to the Senior Center which is unique and \$60,000 is being offered as a donation to entice the waiver. Mr. Dolan seconded the motion

while commenting that this is stretching the unique conditions. A roll call vote was taken. All members voted in favor 5-0.

Mr. Moynihan exited the meeting at 8:40PM as he was not sitting on the next matter. He had recused himself from One Montvale Avenue as an abutter to the property. The Board took a five minute recess and reconvened at 8:45PM.

1 Montvale Avenue

This public hearing had started on April 9, 2025, had a site visit on May 8th and continued at the Planning Board meeting on May 14, 2025. Mr. Vallarelli had previously read the legal notice into the record as follows:

“You are hereby notified that the Stoneham Planning Board, acting as Special Permit Granting Authority, will hold a Public Hearing Wednesday evening, April 9, 2025 in the Hearing Room, Town Hall at 7:00 p.m. to hear all persons interested in a petition for a special permit by ONE MONTVALE AVE, LLC of P.O. Box 990009, Boston, MA 02199, pursuant to Section 4.6.3.1 and 4.6.3.2 to convert a portion of the existing building at One Montvale Avenue, Stoneham, Massachusetts to 51 residential units with 26,279 square feet of the building to remain commercial office space, together with 295 parking spaces in the two existing parking garages on site. Plans by DMS Design LLC dated 11/19/2024, Sheets A-1 to 11 and Ex 1-8 and VHB plan Sheet SV-1 dated 10/23/24 and Site Plan C-1 and C-2 dated 2/18/25 by Engineering Alliance, Inc. may be seen daily except Friday afternoon in the office of the Town Clerk”.

Attorney Houghton explained that he, the architect and engineer had a site visit with some of the Board members on May 8th. Mr. Dolan was taken around the site around noon and Ms. Kelly, Ms. McBride and Mr. Vallarelli attended at the agreed upon time of 4:30PM.

Mr. Houghton reminded the Board that this project meets the requirements under section 7.4.3.1 (a) – (e). It is an appropriate location in the Central Business District. The building is solid. It’s precast concrete on a waffle slab. He explained that there are 295 Parking spaces. The residents will have parking exclusively in the Montvale Ave garage. Mass Eye & Ear will be on the Flint Ave side. In their decision the Board of Appeals included a condition that there be a gate installed to separate the two garages. He mentioned the report done by Vanasse & Associates with the trip generation. This would have less traffic than all office space. Mr. Houghton spoke about the current taxes of \$164, 890 with the vacancies. He also reminded the Board there would be 51 units with townhouses constructed on the top floors. These would be rental units ranging from about \$3,000-\$4,000 a month. He stated there would be affordable units. Mr. Vallarelli asked how many affordable units. Mr. Houghton believed that seven would need to be affordable under the bylaw but he has asked the building Commissioner for a written determination.

Mr. Dolan asked for a projection of what the real estate taxes would be as built. Mr. Houghton stated that he had asked the Assessor’s Office and was waiting for a number. Mr. Dolan asked if it would be more than \$164,000 and Mr. Houghton imagined it would be well over that amount. Most likely twice as much.

Ms. Wengen asked if the affordable units would be by a lottery with preference given to Stoneham residents. Mr. Houghton indicated that seven units equal to the other units built would be affordable and tenants would be chosen by lottery with preference given to Stoneham residents.

Mr. Dolan asked about Ms. Wengen's previous concern about the lack of a trash chute or trash room for the town houses. Dan Skolski, the architect, stated there would not be a trash chute as they are not easy to keep clean. There would be trash rooms instead with barrels that would be emptied. He indicated that the plan had not changed but if it is the desire of the Board they can make it happen. Mr. Dolan thought it was interesting that they would not put a trash room on each floor. Again, Mr. Skolski stated they could add it in. Ms. Wengen asked if there would be covered bins in the room. Mr. Skolski stated they would be covered bins that would be emptied by maintenance regularly. Ms. Kelly asked if recycling would be in the room. Mr. Skolski stated that would be included in the trash room.

Mr. Vallarelli read an email from Linda Barth of 12½ Flint Ave once again requesting that the crack in the garage be addressed. Mr. Houghton mentioned that it was a condition with the ZBA decision.

Mr. Vallarelli also mentioned the Mass Eye & Ear correspondence received by the Board and asked if they had representation present. Attorney Kristine Hung of Riemer & Braunstein was present representing Mass Eye & Ear. She explained their history as tenants for decades. She explained that Mass Eye & Ear had recently undergone a renovation of about \$10 million on their office space. They also signed a new agreement extending their lease from 2033 to 2043. Ms. Hung continued to say that although they recognize the applicant's right, desire, necessity to redevelop and they have no problem with 51 units which is a great use, it is a large construction project. They will be converting a good portion of the building and adding two floors. Mass Eye & Ear is concerned with how the construction might disrupt their delicate surgeries. Surgeries that are specialized procedures sensitive to dust and vibration. Ms. Hung stated that they are interested in knowing items such as where the lay down area would be, parking for construction crews, when water might be shut-off, the number of construction workers on site, the traffic plan, whether there would be cranes used, possible road closures and handicapped accessibility during construction.

Mr. Dolan asked about the renovations that Mass Eye & Ear is making. He stated that they are doing a significant amount of construction themselves and asked if that interfered. John Mazzone, the manager for Mass Eye & Ear indicated that the work was done after hours.

Ms. Hung just wanted to open the line of communication. She also mentioned that under section 7.4.3.2, the Planning Board can condition this.

Mr. Dolan asked how long the construction might take. Mr. Houghton suspected about a year. He added that Mass Eye & Ear had been renovating for 9 months already and aren't done. They spent about \$10 million. Mr. Houghton mentioned his client will be spending about \$50 million.

Mr. Houghton stated that his client as the landlord doesn't want to interfere with the quiet enjoyment of the tenant. They have no problem communicating with Mass Eye & Ear. He also mentioned that his client is also a tenant. His offices are in the building. Mr. Houghton continued to say that the addendum that Mass Eye & Ear added to their letter is overkill.

Mr. Dolan asked Mr. Houghton how long it might take to get a construction schedule. Mr. Skolski responded about a week to come up with a rough draft.

Matt Kilty of 6 Rowe Street commented that he is a professional contractor. He understands construction management plans. He stated they are routine and it is not an unusual request. He agreed that it should be stipulated that the plan be shared with the neighbors. He did not think they could do the construction in a year. Given his experience, he believed it would take longer to build out. They couldn't do it in 9-12 months. He also indicated that he's concerned because the previous owners did a lot of construction on parking garages and flooded the neighborhood with cars. Mr. Kilty further commented that he and his wife were disappointed when they showed up for the site walk and couldn't find Mr. Houghton or the Board members. He reiterated concerns with the loading and unloading and package delivery that he had made at the previous meeting. He spoke about the amount of Amazon deliveries and what not that will flood the neighborhood. He stated his desire to see a right hand turn only out of the Flint Ave garage.

Kim Powell, the property manager for One Montvale, stated that deliveries for Mass Eye & Ear currently come through the front door. She stated that Mass Eye & Ear have many deliveries daily. She explained that at the lower level door there will room for mail and package deliveries on the Flint Ave side.

Mr. Houghton reminded the Board that a loading dock is not required under the bylaw.

Ms. Powell also indicated that Mr. Mazone was incorrect. The Mass Eye & Ear renovations done in the last year and a half were done during the day. They were not exclusively done during off hours. Work was done during the business day and it wasn't an issue. She stated that they are sensitive to their needs but it wasn't an issue with their build outs. She also addressed Mr. Kilty's comments about construction taking more than a year. They are renovating a nine story high rise in Boston from commercial to residential. It is a nine month build out. So it can be done and is currently being done. They have a vast amount of subcontractors.

Mr. Mazone reiterated that Mass Eye & Ear is a hospital licensed space. They have to confidently provide infection control and monitor vibration. They need to be able to acknowledge that there is no dust. If you are getting an injection or laser in the eye, you want to make sure there is no vibration. It's very important to patient care. Mr. Houghton stated that is why they do not mind providing a construction management plan. Attorney Hung added that is the nature of this tenant. They have critical outpatient procedures. They owe a duty of care to their patients. She would like to see a condition added with a requirement for a Construction Management Plan to be reviewed and approved by appropriate Town departments with provisions for coordination with abutting property owners and Mass Eye & Ear. Mr. Houghton didn't see anything wrong with agreeing to that. Mr. Dolan agreed that it is a reasonable request. He didn't see the need for all of the individual items listed in the addendum to be conditioned in the Special Permit. Ms. Wengen asked who would monitor on the Town side. Ms. Sagarino indicated to the Board that the Building Commissioner and Planning Director had discussed it and agreed that necessary departments including Police, Fire and DPW would weigh in when necessary.

Mr. Dolan commented again that the construction management plan as reviewed by town departments is a reasonable request. He also thought that they might consider the concern regarding Amazon

deliveries as during his site visit he noticed how congested Flint Ave was with no parking at noon. With 51 units being added, Mr. Dolan would like to find a place for Amazon deliveries that would be least intrusive to the abutters. And allow them to get in and out as quickly as possible. Mr. Houghton stated that Ms. Powell had explained the mail and package delivery. There was some additional comments and ideas. Mr. Houghton stated that to put no parking on Flint Ave would require the approval of the Town Administrator who isn't inclined to do so at this time. Mr. Kilty thought that this body could make that decision. When it wasn't the Board of Appeals, he thought that the Planning Board could make the decision. He expected they would discuss it on the walk through. Ms. Sagarino explained that the Town Administrator has authority over the no parking or loading zone area. Mr. Sheehan has discussed it with his traffic advisory commission made up of the Police Chief, Safety Officer, Fire Chief, DPW Director, Parking Clerk and Director of Planning. Mr. Sheehan is not inclined to make any changes but with revisit after construction if necessary.

Ms. Wengen asked for clarification on what would be done in a week. Is it a construction management plan? A construction schedule? Are those the same? Mr. Skolski stated they are different. The construction schedule will speak to the timeline and the activities that will take place and in what order. The construction management plan will describe management movement around the site, lay down areas, cranes and vehicles. Overall issue is not requests but how they are administered. This is extremely unusual. It's usually between the landlord and tenant, not the Planning Board through the Special Permit process so that the Town then has to administer this condition. Mr. Dolan agrees but stated that this situation is unique with Mass Eye & Ear. Mr. Dolan asked how long a proposed construction management plan would take and Mr. Skolski stated it would be about two weeks.

Mr. Dolan suggested that this matter be continued to give time to have construction schedules and management plans drafted. Maybe more conversation with the Town Administrator regarding the parking issues. They might get more specifics for Amazon drop offs. Mr. Dolan asked about the next meeting. Ms. Kelly stated the next meeting is June 11th. Attorney Houghton asked if they could meet again before the regular meeting. Could they have a meeting solely for this matter? Mr. Houghton mentioned that the ZBA took three meetings before a decision was rendered. This has been taking some time. Ms. Powell added that they have no problem sitting down with the tenant. In fact they had agreed to do so before this letter was sent to the Board by Mass Eye & Ear.

Ms. Wengen suggested continuing to May 28th or June 4th. Mr. Kilty was unavailable on May 28th and Mr. Vallarelli could not make it on June 4th. Mr. Houghton indicated that they are aware of Mr. Kilty's concerns.

Mr. Dolan made a motion to continue the public hearing for One Montvale Avenue to May 28, 2025 at 7PM in the Town Hearing Room waiving all time standards. Ms. McBride seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor 5-0.

Mr. Dolan made a motion to adjourn which was seconded by Ms. McBride. All members voted in favor 5-0.

The meeting adjourned at 9:51 PM.

Respectfully submitted:

Maria Sagarino
Town Clerk

Documents and other exhibits used by the Planning Board during this meeting to be made part of the official record but not attached to these minutes:

A plan by PJF and Associates entitled “Existing conditions Site Plan of 134 Elm Street in Stoneham, MA” dated April 15, 2025

Plans by DMS Design LLC dated 11/19/2024, Sheets A-1 to 11 and Ex 1-8 and VHB plan Sheet SV-1 dated 10/23/24 and Site Plan C-1 and C-2 dated 2/18/25 by Engineering Alliance, Inc.

Parking study by Vanasse & Associates for 1 Montvale Avenue

Two letters dated January 18, 2025 by structural engineer for 1 Montvale Avenue pertaining to the two parking garages as conditioned in the ZBA decision.

Letter from Mass Eye & Ear with Addendum A received on May 8, 2025.

Email from Linda Barth of 12½ Flint Ave.