



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, December 10, 2025**

Town Hall Hearing Room

**7:00 PM**

Members Present: Chair Frank Vallarelli, Vice Chair Kevin Dolan, Marcia Wengen, Brianna Kelly and Associate Member Ellen McBride.

Also present at the meeting: Town Clerk Maria Sagarino acting as Clerk for the Planning Board, Attorney Charles Houghton, Nick Noon of Right Whale Development and Daniel Skorski of DMS Design LLC..

The Chair brought the meeting to order at 7:01 PM. Mr. Vallarelli introduced the Board, including Associate Member Ellen McBride who would sit in for Dan Moynihan.

Minutes

Mr. Vallarelli accepted a motion from Ms. Wengen to approve the minutes for November 12, 2025 which was seconded by Ms. Kelly. All four full members present voted in favor 4-0.

Confirm meeting dates for January-June 2026

- January 14, 2026
- February 11, 2026
- March 11, 2026
- April 8, 2026
- May 13, 2026
- June 10, 2026

Board members indicated they were fine to continue holding meetings on the second Wednesday of the month into June 2026.

Public Hearings

72 Central Street

Mr. Vallarelli moved on to the first public hearing of the evening and 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, December 10, 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 RIGHT WHALE DEVELOPMENT LLC of 18 Bricklin Road, Chelmsford,, MA to demolish the existing building at 72 Summer [Central] Street, Stoneham, MA and to construct three Town House units at 72 Central Street, Stoneham, MA. A plan by George C. Collins, PLS entitled “Proposed Conditions Plan at 72 Central Street Stoneham, MA” dated September 3, 2025 and a rendering by ahp Architects dated September 24, 2025 may be seen daily except Friday afternoon in the office of the Town Clerk”.

Mr. Vallarelli invited Attorney Houghton to speak on the matter. Mr. Dolan asked if Attorney Houghton was before the Board looking for residences in the Central Business District. He then cited the ZBA decision that allows them to do away with the required commercial space. Mr. Houghton responded that was the case and explained that the Zoning Board of Appeals had granted a variance to do away with the 50% of commercial space that would be required on the first floor and the intention is to build three residential units. The Board was given a plan & rendering. Mr. Houghton explained that the foundation is gone on the existing house. It has been determined that it would be negligent to correct. If the house was raised to put a new foundation, there would also be new windows, new siding and a complete renovation inside. There would be nothing historic left of this house built in the late 1700s. They cannot salvage the house. It is too cost prohibitive and there is nothing worth saving.

Mr. Houghton continued to explain that on that end of Central Street the neighborhood has a residential character. There is a three-unit condo across the street and everything else in the direct vicinity is residential. Mr. Houghton added that the proposed project meets the bylaw. It’s in harmony with the intent of the bylaw and the neighborhood. It satisfies the criteria listed in section 7.4.3.1 (a)-(e).

Ms. Wengen asked if there was a rendering that showed the neighbors houses so she could determine how close they are. Mr. Houghton did not have one available. Ms. McBride pulled up google maps and told Ms. Wengen that there was about thirty feet on one side and about twenty-five feet from the neighbors on the other side. Ms. McBride showed Ms. Wengen the online picture of the properties. Ms. Kelly asked about the car shown at the back of the rendering and asked if there was additional parking back there. Mr. Houghton stated that the car shown shouldn’t be there. In an earlier version they thought about moving the house up and putting parking behind, but it didn’t make sense, so they moved the house back with parking in front. Ms. McBride asked if this could be commercial businesses because it’s in Central Business. Mr. Houghton stated that it could but all residential made more sense at that end of Central Street.

Mr. Vallarelli read the department comments from the Director of Planning, Police, Fire and DPW into the record.

Mr. Vallarelli opened the meeting to the public. Joe Mangano, 70 Central Street stated that he is in favor of the project and wishes them luck. Mr. Houghton went through section 7.4.3.1 (a)-(e). This is an appropriate use that will not adversely affect the neighborhood. There’s no nuisance or

hazard created. He added that each unit will have one space in the driveway and one garage space.

Mr. Dolan believed that it is a good project. He prefers the three townhouses rather than the commercial use. He did mention that the proposed design is a little plain and asked if they would consider dressing it up a bit. He asked what type of siding they would be using. The petitioner, Nick Noon, responded that they planned on white vinyl siding. He added that when they saw the property in this neighborhood, they believed their proposal was the best use. Commercial space would be hard with limited street parking. Mr. Dolan again asked if the design could be dressed up a bit. Mr. Noon stated that they could try to add more character. Mr. Dolan believed the Board should consider a condition of approval to require review of the design plan. Mr. Houghton agreed that they could produce a façade plan. Ms. Wengen wondered if shutters could be added. Mr. Vallarelli commented that they could do something similar to what was done with 22 Wright Street. Mr. Houghton stated that Mr. Noon could take a look at 22 Wright Street to get an idea. Ms. Kelly asked about landscaping on the rendering and whether something could be submitted. Mr. Noon indicated there would be landscaping and that could be shown.

Mr. Dolan asked if these townhouses would be for sale and Mr. Noon responded yes. Mr. Vallarelli asked about the condition set forth in the ZBA decision about the knotweed. Mr. Houghton explained that George Ricardelli had an issue with the knotweed encroaching on his property. He wanted assurance that it would be dealt with and cleaned up, so the ZBA added a condition. Mr. Noon also explained that they had agreed to let Ms. Wengen come in and take pictures to document the history. Ms. Wengen had passed that offer to the Historical Commission and questioned whether Mr. Noon had heard from them. He had not.

With no further comment from the public, Ms. Kelly made a motion to close the public hearing which was seconded by Ms. McBride. All members voted in favor 5-0 to close the public hearing.

Mr. Dolan made a motion to approve. He stated that this project complies with the parameters of section 7.4.3.1 (a)-(e). Parking will be all on site. It's the best use of the site. He incorporated all Town department comments and the ZBA decision and conditions as well as a condition that any approval granted would be subject to receipt and approval of a façade plan by the Board. Ms. Kelly seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Four members voted in favor with one abstention by Ms. Wengen. The petition was approved 4-0-1.

#### One Montvale Avenue

Mr. Vallarelli moved to the final public hearing and read the meeting 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, December 10, 2025 in the Hearing Room, Town Hall at 7:00 p.m. to hear all persons interested in a petition for an amended 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 amend the Special Permit granted on May 29, 2025 for 51 residential units to 60 residential units and reduce by 2207 square feet the portion of the building to remain commercial office space at One Montvale Avenue. Plans by DMS Design LLC dated 10/27/2025, revised Sheets A-1 - 8 and Sheets Ex 1-5 and 7-8 and VHB plan Sheet SV-1 dated 10/23/24 and Site Plan C-1 dated 10/27/25 by Engineering Alliance, Inc. may be seen daily except Friday afternoon in the office of the Town Clerk”.

To begin, Mr. Vallarelli asked Mr. Houghton to explain what is being eliminated and what is being added. He isn't sure the square footage is adding up. Mr. Houghton responded that the architect has his computer and can walk them through the changes, but Mr. Thibeau, the owner of the building, has about 5200 square feet of commercial space for his office. It's more than he needs. He'd like to reduce it to about 3000 square feet. That would reduce the parking calculation and he proceeded to go through his conversation with the Building Commissioner about the new calculation needed for parking. Mr. Dolan understands that they are way over on the parking spaces required. His only reaction when looking at this, would be that generally with an amended Special Permit, if it is de minimus, they would go ahead and vote on it. Mr. Dolan isn't sure this is de minimus when it is going from 51 units to 60 residential units and there is a ZBA decision based on 51 units. He doesn't know how this wouldn't require a new Special Permit, but he is willing to hear them on the matter. Mr. Houghton believed the variances granted wouldn't change. The parking requirement is the only thing that changed and it went down. Mr. Houghton also indicated that they want to go to 59 units instead of the 60 units. There is some waffling in the concrete of the roof and we needed to reduce by 1 unit. Mr. Houghton mentioned that he spoke to Town Counsel three weeks ago and he believed that the 51 units were grandfathered in and any mitigation under the new regulations would be solely for the additional units. Mr. Houghton's contention is that they are not changing the building at all, the parking lot or the parking garages. Mr. Dolan asked if Mr. Houghton feels that it is de minimus. Mr. Houghton believes that it is.

At this point Mr. Vallarelli asked if they could walk through the changes as he is still not clear on all of the changes being made. He'd like to hear from the architect on what is going and what is coming. He doesn't understand how you get 9 more units when you are only eliminating 2200 square feet of commercial space. Mr. Houghton responded that some of the units that were townhouses will now be flats.

Dan Skolski the architect on the project walked the Board through the changes as they viewed amended plans that he handed out. He began by explaining that after they received all of the approvals, they realized that there was a waffle concrete slab in the roofline that would prevent them from building the interior stairs that they had planned. So, the first change was to eliminate three town house units. Mr. Skolski continued to move through a list of changes that had previously been provide in an email that was given to the Board, as follows, focusing on sheets A1 and A2:

#### Changes to Sheet A1

- the three townhouse units on the upper left of the plan are now flats
- added a closet adjacent to the residential elevator.
- removed the residential storage units from the bottom left of the plan. Labeled this space as

Residential Amenity Space.

- the Residential Amenity Space has become units. We added four 1-bedroom units here.
- we have some space for residential storage units, so we showed that.
- we eliminated the extra egress stair, Plan North
- we moved the parcel storage room

Ms. McBride asked what was in place before and Ms. Kelly showed her the older plan which showed it had been residential amenity space.

#### Changes to Sheet A2

- the three townhouse units on the upper left of the plan are now flats.
- we drew the existing electrical room between Stair 3 and the bathrooms.
- added two units to the left of the plan, facing One Montvale. This space is currently Bill Thibeau's office and the fitness room. One 1 bed and one 2 bed.
- we eliminated the extra egress stair, Plan North

Ms. Wengen asked about some blank space on the sheet. She wanted to know if it was Mr. Thibeau's office. Mr. Skolski stated it was.

Mr. Skolski felt confident that he had addressed the change in square footage and how they got from 51 units to 59 units. Mr. Vallarelli asked if all of the other floors are identical to what was presented last time. Mr. Skolski stated that is correct with the exception of some minor changes that are not part of the approval. Mr. Vallarelli asked if the town houses are only on the top floor now. Mr. Skolski stated that is correct. Ms. Kelly asked about minor square footage changes and Mr. Skolski stated that happened with reconfiguration and doesn't need approval. Ms. McBride asked if the changes were all to the interior. Mr. Skolski indicated that they are. Ms. McBride wondered if it was like the previous application that sought to build three units. If they decided to build two and it didn't change the outside, would they have to come back. Mr. Vallarelli stated that if they are given approval to build three, they have to build three. Ms. Kelly also added that with one Montvale they are decreasing the commercial space while at the same time seeking additional units. Mr. Skolski stated that although they had to come back, the impact to the community is minor. Mr. Vallarelli doesn't seem to agree as it increases the number of rental units which also changes other calculations down the road.

Ms. McBride asked if they needed to go back to the ZBA. Ms. Kelly wondered that as well. Mr. Skolski didn't believe so. Ms. Kelly questioned that. She was having trouble understanding if the ZBA voted on a certain square footage and number of units in a plan presented, why they wouldn't have to go before that Board again. Mr. Dolan agreed. They approved variances based on 51 units, not 59. Ms. Kelly wondered how the Planning Board would feel if it were the opposite and the Planning Board approved a Special Permit and another Board made a decision without checking with them. Mr. Dolan stated that we have guidance from Town Counsel. Ms. Sagarino explained that she had only asked Attorney Galvin whether or not this was considered a modification of a Special Permit or a new Special Permit. She did not ask him if the matter should have gone back to the ZBA. Attorney Galvin had opined that the Planning Board could use their discretion as to whether an additional 8-9 units was de minimus or not. Ms. Kelly looks at this as having two questions. Should it go back to the ZBA? Should this be heard as a new

Special Permit application or is it a modification. Ms. Sagarino explained that based on what Attorney Galvin said, the Planning Board has discretion as to whether the change is substantial enough to be considered as a new application and if they feel it is they should state why, like this needs to be a new Special Permit because 8 units are being added and the approved plans changed.

Mr. Dolan said that there is nothing that says the Board has to render a decision tonight. He asked when this was filed. Mr. Houghton responded that it was filed 3 weeks ago. Mr. Dolan stated that they are well within the time standards to continue the matter.

Mr. Vallarelli read the department comments from the Director of Planning who suggested it should be viewed as a new Special permit application. The Police and Fire had the same comments as last time. Ms. Sagarino explained that the DPW Director Brett Gonsalves was holding off on commenting until he found out if it was a new Special Permit or not.

Mr. Vallarelli opened the meeting to the public. Matt Kilty, 6 Rowe Street spoke against the increase in units. He was against the increase in density. He read a lengthy prepared statement speaking to overburdening the neighborhood and creating more traffic congestion. He believes that further traffic assessment needs to be done. Residential units bring an exponential increase in deliveries.

Alana Arangio, 7 Thompson Pond Road commented that the parking is on the Flint Ave side of the building but the handicapped entrance is to the left and she wondered if that might be changed. She spoke on behalf of the patients and the danger in having them have to walk along Main Street to get to the ramp closer to the Montvale Avenue side. They can't get dropped off in front because it's a travel lane. She also commented that the elevator is then in the back, far corner. Mr. Dolan parks on the Main Street level and goes in the front door. The elevator is only 25 feet away. Ms. Kelly sits at the light all the time and does see what she is saying about the ramp being located on the left side. Ms. McBride thought there was a door to access the building from the open-air parking lot. Mr. Houghton responded that it is locked. Mass Eye & Ear wants it locked. Ms. Arangio stated that is because it opens up directly into their facility.

Kathy Hudson, 3 Flint Ave spoke about the congestion during the regular day time with deliveries not only to that address but Gaetano's and Rosetree Plaza. There is a lot of double parking. Parking is an issue. Flint, Cottage and Rowe are used as cut through streets at all times of the day.

Bill Goss, 7 Rowe Street stated that he has lived in the neighborhood for 42 years and has seen the neighborhood modify. He endorses everything Matt Kilty stated. He heard all of the discussions at the original hearing and with the ZBA. They have plenty of parking in the garages but they forgot to look at the big picture. It's not just about the residential, but about the Mass Eye & Ear. He also agreed with the horrendous number of deliveries. He is not averse to development but he is averse to expansion.

Mr. Houghton stated this building is not new. It predates everyone who spoke tonight. It used to house many Federal offices. The use of residential is less than what was there before as far as

traffic according to the study done by Jeffrey Dirk of Vanasse Associates. They are trying to make the best use of the building. Maybe Mass Eye & Ear can look at redesigning their layout to better accommodate their patients.

Mr. Vallarelli asked why they didn't ask for 59-60 units six months ago. Ms. McBride asked if there was ever conversation about deliveries off of Montvale Ave with a room in the back. That was discussed but Mr. Houghton stated it is on the Flint Ave side with a turnaround to drop off. Mr. Skolski stated that they had to agree to put a gate in to prevent cutting through from Montvale to Flint. Delivery trucks fit better off of Flint. Mr. Skolski said they can take a second look. Ms. McBride stated it might relieve some of the concerns by the neighbors.

Ms. Kelly asked if they could go over snow storage. She asked if it is shown on the new plan. Mr. Houghton said that they would be trucking it off. He did, however, comment that there are 150 extra spaces that they could utilize if need be.

At this point, Mr. Dolan suggested that the matter be continued until the first meeting in January. We have questions as to whether this is an amended Special Permit or brand new, the question for the ZBA and the mitigation regulations. This will also give Mr. Houghton time to respond to Mr. Kilty's many comments.

Mr. Dolan made a motion to continue 1 Montvale until January 14, 2026 at 7PM. Ms. McBride seconded. All members voted in favor 5-0.

Before adjourning, Ms. Sagarino mentioned that Attorney Houghton needed an ANR endorsed for the China Moon/Hago Harrington property. They are creating one lot out of two. Mr. Houghton indicated that they will most likely develop commercial space rather than the residential units previously talked about.

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

The meeting adjourned at 8:31 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 George C. Collins, PLS entitled "Proposed Conditions Plan at 72 Central Street Stoneham, MA" dated September 3, 2025 and a rendering by ahp Architects dated September 24, 2025.

Plans of One Montvale Avenue by DMS Design LLC dated 10/27/2025, revised Sheets A-1 - 8 and Sheets Ex 1-5 and 7-8 and VHB plan Sheet SV-1 dated 10/23/24 and Site Plan C-1 dated 10/27/25 by Engineering Alliance, Inc.

Memo from Matt & Rachael Kilty 6 Rowe Street dated December 10, 2025