



TOWN OF  
**STONEHAM**  
MASSACHUSETTS  
Town Hall  
35 Central Street  
Stoneham, Massachusetts 02180  
**BOARD OF APPEALS**  
**781-279-2695**

**Stoneham Board of Appeals Minutes**  
**Tuesday, May 30, 2024**  
**Town Hall Hearing Room**  
**6:00 PM**

Members of the Board present: Chair Tobin Shulman, Vice Chair Robert Saltzman, Eric Rubin, Kevin McLaughlin, R. Michael Dufour and Associate Members William Sullivan and Mark Russell.

Also present: Town Clerk Maria Sagarino acting as Clerk to the Board of Appeals, Attorney Charles Houghton, Scott Weiss representing Fellsway Development LLC/The Gutierrez Co., and Susan Spratt from McKenzie Engineering. Many Executive Drive residents, Ravine Road residents and members of the Friends of the Fells were also present.

Present remotely: Town Counsel Robert Galvin

After dealing with a few technical issues with the GoToMeeting, the meeting was called to order at 6:16 PM by Chair Tobin Shulman. Mr. McLaughlin led the Pledge of Allegiance. Mr. Shulman introduced the Board. He explained the procedure for the public hearing on the Residences at Spot Pond which had begun on January 18, 2024 and was continued to February 28<sup>th</sup>, March 20<sup>th</sup>, March 27<sup>th</sup>, May 1<sup>st</sup>, May 21<sup>st</sup> and again this evening. He explained that the Board needed to take care of a few housekeeping items after which they will invite Susan Spratt the engineering consultant to present her final review. He indicated that they would concentrate the focus on drainage this evening.

Attorney Houghton requested a six month extension for a decision granted for 145 Elm Street. Mr. Saltzman made a motion to grant the extension which was seconded by Mr. McLaughlin. All members voted in favor 5-0.

Attorney Houghton requested a six month extension for a decision granted for 25 Pond Street. Mr. Saltzman made a motion to grant the extension which was seconded by Mr. McLaughlin. All members voted in favor 5-0.

Mr. Shulman invited Susan Spratt of McKenzie Engineering to present her review of the drainage plan. Ms. Spratt began by explaining that she and her colleagues were tasked with look at the drainage plans in accordance with the Stoneham Zoning bylaws, the Stormwater Management Rules and Regulations and the Mass DEP Stormwater Management Standards. Ms. Spratt explained that they had done four reviews beginning in February. After the first review the developer provided a revised set of plans. For the second review they were in disagreement with the TSS removal. McKenzie Engineering wanted 90% TSS and 60% phosphorous as part of the requirement requested by the Town to meet the MS4 requirement. Ms. Spratt had met and

discussed this with the DPW Director. The applicant had come back and argued that it was DCR jurisdiction due to the subsurface closed drainage system under DCR jurisdiction. She went on to say that although it is not a DCR project, DCR is still required with their systems under MS4 to follow 90/60. She also explained that there was disagreement with the ½” treatment. Part of the 90/60 requires 1”. She admitted that she didn’t catch this in the initial review, but she subsequently commented that MA DEP Stormwater Management requires that 65% so impervious area has to be captured and directed toward an infiltration based system and they fell under 65%. They were going to look at the MBTA basin off-site that part of their drainage was being directed to. She went on to mention other inconsistencies with slopes and pipes that needed clarification. Everything as comments on the first round had now been addressed. Their third review letter addressed all comments in the second letter including a revision to the plan for the 65% impervious area. They also tweaked some of their calculations. McKenzie had a comment on a material in a pocket that might decrease infiltration. They agreed to remove bad material and they would be using a weighted system. She concluded that all drainage now satisfies the Town’s standards and all the MA DEP standards 1-10.

Mr. Shulman asked the Board if they had any questions. Mr. Saltzman asked about page 16 of the second engineering review letter toward the bottom of the page under comment 50. It says “MEG Response: Comment not satisfied. Submittal of the revised details as part of the final building set could be made as a condition of approval”. He wanted to know if that should be a condition. Ms. Spratt responded that they did provide details but she wanted details of each individual pond instead of the standard sheet you get from the Stormtech. She also asked for individual details of their outlet control structure. It can be handled as part of final building documents. She likes it as a separate detail because sheets tend to get torn apart. This way it’s on the detail sheet as well as the plan.

Mr. Saltzman also asked about page 9 towards the bottom where it is highlighted in yellow. He asked if everything was satisfied. Ms. Spratt indicated that they had come back with new calculations using a 1” to calculate the required water quality volume. On page 4 she commented on 90/60. Mr. Saltzman asked if that was satisfied. Ms. Spratt stated that they had satisfied greater than 90 and 66 with phosphorous.

With all this being said, Mr. Saltzman confirmed with Ms. Spratt that all of the stormwater and drainage passes with her approval. Ms. Spratt agreed that everything met with their approval. It all complies with Town regulations and DEP regulations. Ms. Sagarino added that the DPW Director had looked at everything Ms. Spratt had sent and he was very happy with the information and agreed with all of their comments. Ms. Sagarino asked on behalf of Attorney Galvin if Ms. Spratt would supply the Board with any conditions she feels are necessary in the Comprehensive Permit. Ms. Spratt agreed to supply the Board with any conditions she deemed necessary. Mr. Saltzman asked if this would include the submittal of the revised details plans. Ms. Spratt stated they can review the final building documents and look at all of the control structures.

Attorney Galvin was able to join the meeting remotely as the GoToMeeting issues were rectified. To this point he had been livestreaming the meeting.

Mr. Shulman now opened the meeting up to the public specifically for drainage and site plan questions and comments specific to the presentation Ms. Spratt just gave.

Diane Trovato of 11 Executive Drive noticed on some of the comments that trash was mentioned. The Board of Health conditions dumpster locations on site. Mr. Weiss responded that there were no external dumpsters proposed. Ms. Trovato wanted to know why there were so many comments. Mr. Houghton explained that under our bylaws the Board of Health permits dumpsters.

Ms. Trovato stated that the plan only shows one trash room in one building for all 378 units and questions where else there may be trash. Mr. Shulman asked if they could bring it back to drainage. Ms. Trovato stated that she is referring to comments in Ms. Spratt's review. Ms. Trovato stated that she is also worried about water pressure. She said that the comments indicate Stoneham DPW and Fire Department will look at it. She wants to know how she will know whether she is going to lose water pressure. Ms. Trovato indicated that Sterling Hill condominiums had issues with water pressure when they first moved in. There wasn't enough water pressure in their buildings at 7 & 11 Executive Drive. What will happen to the water pressure with 378 units? Attorney Houghton indicated that the Fire Department performs tests when the buildings are built.

Mr. Shulman asked Ms. Spratt if the supply lines bringing water to the site were adequately sized. Ms. Spratt stated that can be made a condition. She wasn't sure if they had already engaged a plumbing and mechanical engineer, but a hydrant flow test can be done. That will tell you whether it can accommodate what is being proposed. She added again that a hydrant flow test can be a condition with the results supplied and have an MAP engineer determine that it has the proper capacity for the project. Mr. Shulman asked if it was typically a problem. Ms. Spratt stated that sometimes it can be. That's why most projects like this do a hydrant flow test to determine capacity.

Jim McMahon of 7 Executive Drive asked if the hydrant flow test is done before or after you build. Ms. Spratt responded that it would be done before you get a building permit. Mr. Saltzman asked if that was routinely done. Ms. Spratt indicated that it was. Sometimes the Board wants to see it during this phase but normally it is a condition and the information is provided to the Board before the Building permit is issued.

Rosemary Galasso of 11 Executive Drive asked about it being routinely done. How would they do it? Mr. Shulman stated that Ms. Spratt said that the Board can add it as a condition of the permit being granted that such a test is performed prior to the issuance of a permit. Ms. Galasso asked if it would be a condition and Mr. Shulman responded in the affirmative. Mr. Houghton added that it is a Fire Department requirement.

A resident at 11 Executive Drive added that when Sterling Hill was built the developer had to add something in the basement to increase the water pressure. Mr. Shulman added that it was most likely some type of a pressure boosting pump.

Marge Powers of Ravine Road admits that she doesn't understand half of what Ms. Spratt said. She read some and apologizing for not being aware of the project until now. She asked about the

pipe and whether a certain diameter had been met. Ms. Spratt explains about the calculator used to determine the size of the pipe. She talks about the Fire Department tests and the phosphorous and wonders how this has progressed so far so fast. Ms. Powers asked about the phosphorous and the process. Ms. Spratt explains about the infiltration into the ground. MA DEP requires anywhere from 50% and up for phosphorous removal which they were meeting using the ½". Stoneham requires 60% which required them to use 1".

Mr. Weiss asked if Ms. Spratt would clarify for the public that this had to do with stormwater management not the water supply. She stated that this is not water supply they are talking about with the 90/60 calculation. Ms. Spratt explains that with their infiltration systems they have mitigated the post development runoff to be less than or equal to preconstruction. With this being built, any stormwater generated will be less than what exists today. Mr. Shulman clarifies it is less water flowing off the site. Ms. Spratt states everything has been put through a hydroCAD program. They have reviewed everything, had issues back and forth and everything is now satisfied. McKenzie Engineering feels confident with what has been provided. Obviously nobody can guarantee because it's water, but with the information provided they are in conformance with all of the MA DEP stormwater requirements. Ms. Powers asked Ms. Spratt if she represents our Town and is looking out for Stoneham. She responded that McKenzie Engineering was engaged by the Town to review the plans.

Alana Anderson of Executive Drive asked Ms. Spratt about the 2 foot barrier mentioned in her initial report. Is that satisfied? Ms. Spratt responded that they needed to do test pits on seasonal high ground water. They have determined there is a minimum 2 foot separation. They have four feet.

Don Anderson of 11 Executive Drive mentioned Diane Trovato's question about water pressure. He wanted to make sure there was no effect on the Sterling Hill water pressure if this is built. Ms. Spratt stated that is part of the hydrant flow test. They look at proposed and existing and the engineer examines the results.

Kathleen McGourthy of Ravine Road in Melrose asked about the types of rain events. How much rainfall does this have a capacity to handle? We've had flooded basements in our neighborhood. Ms. Spratt responded that the two infiltration systems are looked at in terms of a 2, 10, 25 and 100 year storm. They each have an overflow pipe. So in a ten year storm when it exceeds it goes out the pipe into the drainage system. The catch basins are a foot below the water. She explains that an extreme event such as a 100 year storm is when about 8 inches of water comes down in a 24 hour period. The ground becomes completely saturated such that there is nowhere for the water to go. Mr. Weiss added that those numbers have recently been increased by the Town. Ms. Spratt concurs. The current Atlas numbers have increased. Years ago it was 6.6 inches for the 100 year storm. It is now 8.14 or 8.17 for a 100 year storm. Ms. McGourthy asked if contingencies were built in for climate change. Ms. Spratt stated that's why the Atlas number increased to just over 8 inches from the 6.6.

Marie Larcom of Executive Drive asked about the Board making a decision on all of what was presented. You still didn't make a conclusion or determination on the number of units. She wanted the Board to go over what the State required. She asked who had more power, the State or the Town.

Mr. Shulman explains that the State has more power in general and that asked her to clarify. Ms. Larcom wants to know who has the most power over what is built.

Mr. Shulman stated that he will explain the 40B process in general as best he can. He explains that the Board will take all of the information that they have received from the peer reviewers and the applicant. The Board will then issue a decision which is essentially issuing a permit with conditions that are reasonable and fair based on the testimony that the Board has heard. Conditions can include a hydrant flow test and any peer review recommendations. He wasn't referring to this matter necessarily, but in another matter the conditions may have been deemed onerous by the applicant and they do have an appeal available them at the State level in which they can say that the decision was unfair and made the project uneconomic and we've stood in the way of reasonable development. At that point it does go to the State and the Housing Appeals Committee would hear the appeal and make a ruling.

Ms. Larcom asked if the number units already went to the State and they decided on it. Or if the Town already decided the number of units. Mr. Shulman explained that the Town has not made a decision on the number of units. That is what the Board of Appeals is going to decide on.

Mr. Shulman stated if we were to reduce the number of units, the developer could appeal. He could appeal anything in the decision.

James Martens of 31 Ravine Road asked about the citizen's appeal process. He said the applicant can appeal to the State. Can the citizens appeal to the State as well? Mr. Shulman asked Town Counsel to respond.

Attorney Galvin responded that an applicant can appeal if they are not satisfied with the decision or conditions. Abutters who can show that they have suffered some type of harm can appeal under Chapter 40A section 17. The right to appeal is conditioned upon having legal standing. Mr. Galvin mentions that it is never an easy burden to meet. Having been on all sides of this, it is never any easy burden to get over the standing hurdle.

Mr. Galvin further explained that there was a request at the beginning. This project is large and we did not invoke the safe harbor provision. It's not to say we cannot impose provisions to make it smaller, but we did not immediately reject the application as being too large which we would have had to do at the beginning.

Diane Trovato of executive Drive asked if the public will get to hear what the Board decides and if they will be able to comment on the decision including the number of units.

Mr. Saltzman explained that is what the Board is doing now. They are paying attention to all of the concerns and comments from the public. It will not be up for debate once the decision is made. Attorney Galvin asked if he might interject. Mr. Galvin explained that the public hearing is open right now. Members of the public are free to comment. It had been suggested to direct comments to drainage as that was before the Board tonight, but you still may comment on other things. At some point the Board will vote to close the public hearing. All deliberations will be public but at that point the public will no longer be invited to speak.

Gene Amico from Executive Drive asked about the appeals period. Mr. Galvin again explained that under MGL Chapter 40 section 17, there is a 20 day appeal period that runs from the time the decision is filed with the Town Clerk. An appeal would be made to the Land Court or the Superior Court.

Steve Engel from the Friends of the Fells asked about parking being provided for the use of the Fells at the MWRA property. He wanted to know if it was still possible given the drainage and reconfigured layout.

Mr. Weiss responded that there are some dedicated parking spots along Executive Drive which are shown on the latest version of the plan. Mr. Weiss then pulled up the plan on the screen in the Hearing Room to show the spaces that he was referring to. Residents mentioned that people already park there. Mr. Weiss stated that this would formalize the spaces. The residents asked about plantings near Sterling Hill. Mr. Weiss stated that there would be plantings. He mentions the green space that will exist as well. He then pointed out the bus stop past the second driveway. The turnaround spot and layover area is on the far side of the property closer to the parking lot for the Medical Arts building.

Alana Anderson of 11 Executive Drive appreciates the Gutierrez Company listening to us and saving our green space which provides drainage. She is concerned that the same people she is thanking promised to never build housing. The Select Board wrote a letter to the State saying this project was not viable. She knows the State can override that. She knows the Select Board agreed to do away with the covenant. She added that for the sake of the residents at Sterling Hill, the Friends of the Fells and the residents on Ravine Road, this is too big of a project. It concerns her and bothers her. She worries about the easement. There are no protections for Stoneham citizens. Mr. Shulman stated that the permit before them show the green space preserved. Mr. Saltzman added that the approval would run with the project. They would be approving the plan as shown today with the easement intact as green space.

Marie Larcom of Executive Drive thinks the number of people in this small area. They have 48 condos with probably 2 in each unit and Alta Clara with 260 units with probably two in each unit also. Adding 378 units with at least two in each unit will add a thousand people in this one small area. Would any of you want two thousand people in this area? Just imagine in your own minds. Renters can leave at any time but we have investment. I want it to come back to me or my children someday. They are out to get the money.

Brian O'Leary of Executive Drive appreciates the work that the Gutierrez Company has done to preserve the green space. He mentions the research and development proposed a few years ago and the work they did with Scott Weiss and Attorney Houghton. He believes that the green space became part of the permit for that development. Is that something they can do now? Mr. Houghton stated that it is on the plan not to be used.

Susan Storella of Ravine Road asked if they would get some aid to control the traffic. The traffic is tremendous. She mentioned that a tree had come down recently and the road was closed. The traffic was calm. Is anyone taking the traffic into consideration? Mr. Shulman reminded everyone that the applicant did an extensive traffic study. The Town hired peer reviewer Jeffrey Dirk to independently look at the traffic issue. The developer provided some mitigating elements

with public transportation, providing transit screens for the residents and bike racks. Mr. Saltzman added that there will be some money provided by the developer to improve pedestrian access across Woodland Road. There should not be a discernable impact directly to Ravine Road. Ms. Storella stated that since the development up there, Saturday and Sunday are all of a sudden busy. You can do all the traffic studies you like but you should come sit on our porches.

Kathleen McCourthy of Ravine Road in Melrose spoke. She mentioned that the traffic expert didn't look at Ravine Road and Fellsway East in his study. She mentioned again the old agreement put in place for the former Langwood Commons project. She would like the Board to ask Mr. Dirk to look at Ravine and Fellsway East.

Marie Larcom of Executive Drive admits that she uses Ravine Road. She knows it is bad. If she were on Ravine Road she would get out of there. They have an investment but they can't just move. She asks if Ravine Road could be made one way as Philips Road was a few years ago. Ms. Sagarino asked to respond to that question. She mentioned that there is a Traffic Safety Advisory Committee consisting of her as the Parking Clerk, the Town Administrator, the Police Chief, Fire Chief, Safety Office, DPW Director and Town Planner. Ms. Sagarino explains that they meet monthly and admits that they have been talking about Ravine Road for years at this point. This development is not the problem. The problem already exists. It's hard because the roadway belongs to Stoneham, Melrose and DCR. We would like to make a portion of it one way to see if that helps but we need Melrose on board. The Town met with Melrose just last week and nothing much came of it. She reassured everyone that they will keep talking about until something is done that provides some relief but is mindful of the fact that they will never be able to completely fix the problem. At the next traffic meeting we will talk again about the one way or not allowing a turn onto the street during rush hour.

Ms. Travoto of Executive Drive asked about the children's playground and the small size. Mr. Weiss responded that they have discussed young children and reserved a space should there be young children. Prior to a play space it will be shown as open space. Mr. Saltzman expects that dogs will outnumber kids. Mr. Weiss agreed. Mr. Anderson asked where the dog park would be. Mr. Weiss indicated it would be in the center, north of Building A, the front building.

Gene Amico of executive Drive asked if they would restrict dogs like pit bulls. That has not been brought up yet. It's too early.

Rosemary Galasso of 11 Executive Drive asked Mr. Weiss where the parking for the Fells would be on Executive Drive. Mr. Weiss said it's on Executive Drive adjacent to the MWRA property. Mr. Weiss shows the plan on the screen to indicate where it will be.

Don Anderson of Executive Drive asked if there would be anything done to reduce the amount of people that currently park near Life Care Center. Mr. Weiss indicated that there are no plans for that problem. With the new public access to the Fells will have signs and should draw people towards it an away from other places where it was being accessed.

Diane Trovata of 11 Executive Drive asked if the bus would ever go in front of the building. Mr. Weiss said that the MBTA was very specific as to where they will stop. They didn't want to stop

twice but we got them to agree. They will not stop more than twice. The screen in the building will let the resident know when to go outside to meet the bus at the dedicated stop.

Mr. Shulman asked the applicant for any concluding statement. Attorney Houghton summarizes the project. This is the seventh meeting on the project. We have heard from the Town's experts on traffic, architecture and engineering. They were all very thorough. The engineer makes sure more water is not shed off the site than exists today. The traffic engineer Mr. Dirk was here three times. They all made suggestions incorporated into the plan. As far as conditions, most are already in the plan, if they are not they would be amenable to the conditions the Board may want.

Mr. Saltzman asked about the first time we got together. The applicant mentioned that there was a need for a project this size. There is presently a hospital on the site. There was talk about taking the hospital down and how complicated an enterprise it will be.

Mr. Houghton said that the hospital and former power plant will cost \$21 million to remediate and take down. By the time construction happens it might be more. The question is, what happens if this project doesn't get built. What would be done with the albatross? Sterling Hill should be concerned. It is unless and far worse for the environment than anything that will be built on the site. The cost to take down the hospital is one reason the project is proposed at 378 units. The other reason as it will place the Town in a safe harbor where there can be no longer be any 40B applications. Mr. Houghton mentions the Weiss Farm 40B development that the Town appealed and spent almost ten years on only to lose. This development should protect the Town for at least ten years. The reason the number of units is over the figure needed for ten percent is due to the evolving nature of development in Town. Multiple units are being added all the time. 378 units would give us protection and allow the Town to control it. Mr. Houghton said an affordable unit will probably be about \$2400. Some rents in town like 95 Maple will be over three thousand a month. Sterling Hill's mortgages are probably less than what people will be paying in rent with how the world is today. For the benefit of the Town this Board should see it as a good project.

Mr. Houghton also commented on the parking. They have met the 1.7 spaces per unit as stated in the bylaw. They rearranged the parking to allow the easement to remain as green space. They heard the neighborhood and understood it so they made the change. They made a lot of accommodations and changed the plans to suit the comments. Through all of the reiterations, traffic would have been worse with an office park, hospital and research and development. Alana Anderson tried to interrupt with comment from the audience and Mr. Houghton asked her politely to let him finish.

Mr. Houghton quoted the architect's review letter which stated that the site is well situated. Mr. Houghton agreed that the location is perfect. They have worked hard to get access for the Friends of the Fells. It will be good for the neighborhood. The Fells is there for the public to use. None of the experts said that 378 was not a sound number. They didn't say it was a detriment to anybody. To reduce the project to half does not work. The number works with the remediation and allows the Town to be bullet proof with 40B.

Alana Anderson of Sterling Hill apologized for interrupting earlier. She stated that they are not opposed to 40B or poor people living there. She stated that this is not an appropriate location for

so many people to live. The traffic study was done at the point of view of commuters at peak hours, not with those living up there. She apologizes for being part of the traffic on Ravine Road. There is nothing around them. The bus goes to Malden and Boston. They need to get in their car. They won't ride bikes. She added they can put condos across from them and they wouldn't mind. She said the research and development would have come to work and gone from work. They aren't going to the bank, the supermarket and Mexico Lindo. Ms. Anderson mentions people taking up their Sterling Hill parking spaces to go to the Fells. Teenagers come and park. People with dogs are coming up to go through the hole in the fence to get to the Fells. They are not opposed to a largish development but this is a mess.

Don Anderson thinks this proposal is 121 units above the number to be in compliance. If you have to be at 10% who benefits with this. The winners are the developers and the lawyers who represent them. You don't get the income with the renters that you would derive from ownership.

Marie Larcom of Executive Drive stated that they had 25 years to take the hospital down. They could have taken it down cheaper years ago. They didn't so things the way they should have so now we should be inconvenienced by 378 more units across from us. She was livid. 300 and they can still get their money back. They are always thinking of the money. You should have compassion. You should think of the people already there who bought six years ago. She said nobody cares about the people on Ravine Road who are suffering. Who the hell cares. Mr. Shulman interjects that what she has just said is not fair. Mr. McLaughlin reminds Ms. Larcom that the Board are residents and they don't get paid to sit here. They are getting wacked around. He is upset by what she is saying. He has lived in Town for 72 years. He knows what this Town is all about. It's enough. Mr. McLaughlin then asked the Chair for a motion to adjourn.

Mr. McLaughlin made a motion to continue the public hearing until Thursday, June 6<sup>th</sup> at 6PM in the Town Hall Hearing Room. Mr. Saltzman seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. All members voted in favor 5-0.

The meeting adjourned at 8:03 PM

Respectfully submitted:

Maria Sagarino  
Town Clerk

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

The Residences at Spot Pond Comprehensive Permit application and exhibits submitted by Fellsway Development LLC

Any and all comments/letters/emails submitted to the Board by Town departments and/or the public

Written comment letters submitted by the three peer reviewers engaged by the Board of Appeals

Written response by The Gutierrez Company/Fellsway Development LLC to peer review comments

### **Agenda**

Pledge of Allegiance

Request for a six month extension of the decision granted for 145 Elm Street

Request for a six month extension of the decision granted for 25 Pond Street

### **Public Hearing:**

#### **The Residences at Spot Pond – former hospital site**

(Hearing continued from January 18, 2024, February 28, 2024, March 20, 2024, March 27, 2024, May 1, 2024 and May 21, 2024)

*Represented by Attorney Charles Houghton*

An application by Fellsway Development LLC c/o The Gutierrez Company located at 200 Summit Drive, Suite 400, Burlington, Massachusetts, (collectively the “Applicant”) for approval of a Comprehensive Permit in accordance with M.G.L. c. 40B § 20 to 23 for the property at 5 Woodland Road, Stoneham, Massachusetts (See assessors Map 27, Parcels 3, 3CM and 6), regarding a proposed 378-unit residential development known as The Residences at Spot Pond located at 5 Woodland Road in Stoneham, Massachusetts. Pursuant to M.G.L. c. 40B, the applicant requests that the Stoneham Zoning Board of Appeal waive the requirements of the Stoneham By-Laws and act on behalf of any Stoneham permitting authority. The following is a preliminary list of waivers necessary to permit the proposed project. Section 4.15.2.4 for the number of 378 additional units allowed and the maximum density of units per acre of thirty-eight (38). Section 5.2.1 Table One Dimensional Requirements – The proposed front yard setback is 9.2 feet for an accessory structure (garage). Section 5.2.1 Table One Dimensional Requirements – The proposed lot coverage is 31.1%. Section 4.15.2.10 (a) requires 1.7 parking spaces per unit. A waiver of the minimum parking requirements may be needed. Section 18-33R requires twenty-five (25) copies of the application be filed. The application was submitted electronically along with several paper copies. Additional paper copies will be provided as requested. This list will be updated as necessary as permitting proceeds. This hearing is being conducted pursuant to the comprehensive permit provisions of M.G.L. c. 40B and the Town of Stoneham Bylaw Chapter 18. The plans and additional supporting materials may be seen daily except Friday afternoon in the Town Clerk's Office.

Please Note: For members of the public seeking more information on the project visit the dedicated Residences at Spot Pond page linked from the Board of Appeals page of the Town's web site <https://www.stoneham-ma.gov/1042/The-Residences-at-Spot-Pond-Comprehensiv>