



CITY OF SOMERVILLE, MASSACHUSETTS
MAYOR'S OFFICE OF STRATEGIC PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
JOSEPH A. CURTATONE
MAYOR

MICHAEL F. GLAVIN
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

PLANNING DIVISION STAFF

GEORGE PROAKIS, *DIRECTOR OF PLANNING*
LORI MASSA, *SENIOR PLANNER*
DAN BARTMAN, *SENIOR PLANNER*
AMIE HAYES, *PLANNER*
MELISSA WOODS, *PLANNER*
DAWN PEREIRA, *ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT*

Case #: ZBA 2013-57
Date: August 29, 2013
Recommendation: Conditional Approval

PLANNING STAFF REPORT

Site: 97 Prospect Street

Applicant Name: Alan Peterson, Art of Building, LLC

Applicant Address: 7 Fairfield St, Medford, MA 02155

Property Owner Name: Two Squares, LLC

Property Owner Address: 56 Regent St, Cambridge, MA 02140

Alderman: Maryann Heuston

Legal Notice: Applicant, Art of Building, LLC, and Owner, Two Squares, LLC seek a Special Permit with Site Plan Review under §7.11.1.c. to construct seven residential units and a Special Permit under §4.4.1 to substantially alter a nonconforming structure. The Applicant and Owner are also seeking a Variance under §9.5.1.a for approx. six parking spaces. RC zone. Ward 2.

Zoning District/Ward: RC District / Ward 2

Zoning Approval Sought: Special Permit with Site Plan Review under §7.11.1.c & Variance under §9.5.1.a

Date of Application: July 23, 2013

Dates of Public Hearing: Zoning Board of Appeals – September 4, 2013

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1. Subject Property: The subject property sits on a 9,600 square foot lot with a small 1,000 square foot storefront at the southeast corner. The property is ¼ mile south of Union Square. The site was most recently used for a used car and truck parking lot and is completely fenced with chain link. Besides the building, the lot is entirely paved. Since the sale of the property is late 2012, the building and site have been vacant.



2. Proposal: The proposal is to demolish the existing structure and build a 3 story building with 7 residential units. The building will maintain its nonconforming left side yard setback by reusing the existing foundation for the new building. The front elevation has three points of access, the front door accessed from the front porch, a front door at grade for handicapped accessibility, and a ramp and garage door for vehicular access to the garage. The building will have 2 shades of plank siding and a wood wrap feature on the southwest corner.

In the basement there are 8 parking spaces, 7 secured storage areas, and 8 bicycle racks. The existing curbcut towards the center of the parcel will be closed to accommodate a new curbcut to access the driveway that leads to the below grade spaces.

There will be 1 – 1 bedroom, 1 – 2 bedroom, and 5 – 3 bedroom units. Six of the units have usable outdoor space in the form of balconies, decks, and roof decks. Two units have direct access to the yard. The unit without direct access, Unit #1, has a narrow balcony and access to the yard through the common corridor and side door.

As proposed, the site will go from no pervious and landscaping area to 32% and 38% respectively. The ground coverage and floor area ratio will increase but still be conforming.

3. Nature of Application: The proposed project is located within an RC district, which requires a Special Permit with Site Plan Review under SZO §7.11.1.c to allow for development of 7 or more residential units.

The existing structure is nonconforming with respect to the front and left side yard setback, both a roughly 1' away from the lot line. A 15' setback is required for the front yard and a 10' setback is required for side yard. To maintain the nonconforming side yard setback, the proposal includes reusing the foundation of the existing structure for the side yard deck for Unit #2. The new side yard setback will be 5'. This increases the side yard setback from approximately 1' to 5' but it will still be nonconforming.

The Applicant and Owner are also seeking a Variance under §9.5.1.a for six parking spaces. Fourteen parking spaces are required for this development.

Residential Spaces

1 per 1 bedroom, 1 unit = 1 space
1.5 per 2 bedroom, 1 unit = 1.5 spaces
2 per 3 bedroom, 5 unit = 10 spaces

Visitor Spaces

1 per 6 units = 1.16 space

Project Total = 13.66 or 14 spaces

4. **Surrounding Neighborhood:** The subject property is located south of Union Square, near Cambridge. The west side of Prospect Street is zoned Residence C and the east side, Residence B. The surrounding properties are predominantly two-, three- and multi-family dwellings with interspersed auto sales, service and repair uses. The surrounding buildings are largely 2½ story gable-end buildings, triple-decker buildings, and single story commercial structures.

Several MBTA bus routes are within ¼ of a mile and three routes are within 500 feet of the proposed project site, providing easy access to T-stations and the larger metropolitan area. Upon completion of the Green Line Extension, the Union Square Station would be located about 750 feet up Prospect Street.

5. **Impacts of Proposal:** The proposal to demolish the existing storefront will not be detrimental to the neighborhood. It will improve views and access for the existing 2 ½ story home at 99 Prospect Street which is built on the lot line between the parcels. The addition of 7 residential units will bring an active use to the neighborhood. There will be an increase in shadows in the morning on 99 Prospect Street because of the taller building. This will not greatly affect the property since there is only 1 window on that side of the property. There will also be increased shadow on Prospect Street during the afternoon and evening hours.

The parking memo for the project explains that the previous use of the site held as many as 41 cars at one time because of tandem and double parked cars (see the photo above). Using a proper layout, the site could hold 28 spaces. The parking garage proposed holds eight parking spaces, one per unit and one visitor space. The Applicant is seeking a variance for 6 parking spaces. As mentioned the site is within 500 feet of 3 bus lines, 1.1 miles of 4 T stations, and ¼ mile of another 4 bus lines. A parking utilization was conducted for streets within a 5 minute walk of the site. The study area has a total of 338 on street spaces available for use. For both weeknight and weekend afternoon parking counts, there was over 30% of the total parking spaces available or over 100 spaces. In a two minute walk of the site 29 on-street spaces were available.

In addition, the redevelopment of this site fits with the SomerVision plan to limit undesirable uses like the used car lot and requiring infill development to use high-quality and engaging design including elements like bays, porches, street-front landscaping and inviting front doors.

6. **Green Building Practices:** There are no green building practices listed on the application.

7. **Comments:**

Fire Prevention: The property will require a code compliant sprinkler and fire alarm system. A central station monitoring company is required.

Traffic & Parking: The applicant is proposing to redevelop a parcel located at 97 Prospect St. There is an existing single story building on the lot. The applicant proposes to construct a three story residential building to house seven residential units. Per the Somerville Zoning Ordinance (SZO) 14 off street parking spaces are required. The applicant/developer will only be providing 8 off street parking spaces. Obviously 6 off street parking spaces are not being provided.

The applicant has hired a professional Transportation Consultant, Ron Muller and Associates to prepare a Parking Memorandum. The Consulting Firm has submitted a well prepared and professional Parking Memorandum.

The Parking memorandum states that there is available on-street parking spaces in the area surrounding 97 Prospect St. The parking Memorandum also states the proximity of the parcel to be within one mile of four transit stations and that there are three bus routes with ¼ mile of the proposed project. The parking Memorandum further reviews the mode choice for travel of Somerville residents who reside in close proximity to transit stations, Union Square parking ratio comparisons and parking studies relative to Transit Oriented Development (TOD) areas which this parcel is located near to. All this data combines to indicate that there is documented explanation why the 8 of street parking spaces will be sufficient for parking purposes for the proposed development. Based on the submitted Parking Memorandum, Traffic and Parking does not disagree with this assessment.

However the lack of providing all the required off street parking spaces will result in an increase of vehicle queues and delays and a minor decrease in pedestrian safety in the area. Traffic mitigation to offset this lack of required parking spaces and decrease in pedestrian safety and increase in vehicle congestion and queues can be provided by the applicant prior to a Certificate of Occupancy being issues deliver to the City/Traffic and Parking a replacement for all the traffic control signs on Prospect St from the Cambridge/Somerville City line to the intersection of Prospect St/Webster St and also have all the pavement markings along this corridor “repainted” with thermoplastic.

Provided the above traffic mitigation is incorporated, Traffic and Parking has no objection to the application.

Wiring Inspection: Wiring Inspections have reviewed the plans and have no comments at this time.

Lights and Lines: Lights and Lines have reviewed the plans and have no comments at this time.

Engineering: A drainage analysis needs to be submitted prior to a building permit being issued that provides details on the pre vs. post condition. Based on a review of the architectural plans, there are 17 bedrooms proposed. As a result, it does not appear this project would trigger the I/I removal requirement.

Historic Preservation: On Tuesday, July 16, 2013, the Historic Preservation Commission voted (1-6) to determine the c. 1923 A & P store at 97 Prospect Street NOT ‘Significant,’ per Section 2.17.B of the Demolition Review Ordinance 2003-05. The structure is “at least 50 years old,” but is not a significant building or structure after finding that the building or structure is neither:

- i. “Importantly associated with one or more historic persons or events, or with the broad architectural, cultural, political, economic or social history of the City or the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, nor

- ii. “Historically or architecturally significant (in terms of period, style, method of building construction, or association with a reputed architect or builder) either by itself or in the context of a group of buildings or structures, and therefore it is in the public interest to be preserved or rehabilitated rather than to be demolished.”

In accordance with Section 4.2.i of the Demolition Review Ordinance, “If the Commission determines that the building or structure is not a ‘Significant’ building or structure...The Applicant will not be required to take any further steps and the permit may be granted by the Building Inspector.”

Design Review Committee: The Applicant’s first public meeting with the DRC was held on June 26, 2013. The committee made the following recommendations:

- The DRC prefers wood as the siding materials at the entry way.
- The height of the walls at the garage entrance should be lowered to improve visibility for cars exiting the garage.
- The DRC liked the cornice at the top of the building but felt that the cornices at the top of the bays were unnecessary or needed more design input.
- There should be access from the building (at least a few units) directly into the backyard.
- Bicycle parking, trash, and mechanical equipment need to be shown on the next iteration of the plans.
- The front entry should be more pronounced.

The Applicant’s second public meeting with the DRC was held on July 25, 2013. The committee made the following recommendations:

- Red brick is used to connect the building to the existing neighborhood. However, there is not enough red brick to create that connection. The Applicant should consider a way to increase the amount of red brick on the site or a better way to integrate the building into the neighborhood.
- The entrance to the garage needs more articulation of material. Since there is a large cantilever above, the structure could be expressed as an engaged pilaster on the side wall with ship-lap siding leading into the garage.
- The depth of the steel beam supporting the building over the entrance ramp into the garage should be increased so that it appears appropriate relative to the loads that it is supporting.
- The surface bike parking is not necessary. Tenant bike parking can be accommodated in the storage areas in the basement. Visitor bike parking can be accommodated on the sidewalk.
- It was suggested that the open louvers that are used as natural ventilation for parking garage could incorporate the cable rail that is used at the front of the building.

The DRC recommended the Applicant proceed to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Ward Alderman: Alderman Heuston has been contacted but has not provided comments at this time.

II. FINDINGS FOR SPECIAL PERMIT with SITE PLAN REVIEW (SZO §4.4.1 & §7.11.1.c):

In order to grant a special permit with site plan review, the SPGA must make certain findings and determinations as outlined in §5.2.5 of the SZO. This section of the report goes through §5.2.5 in detail.

1. Information Supplied: The Staff finds that the information provided by the Applicant conforms to the requirements of §5.2.3 of the SZO and allows for a comprehensive analysis of the project.

2. Compliance with Standards: The Applicant must comply “with such criteria or standards as may be set forth in this Ordinance which refer to the granting of the requested special permit with site plan review.”

In considering a special permit under §4.4, Staff find that the alterations and use proposed would not be substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood than the existing structure.

3. Purpose of District: The Applicant has to ensure that the project "is consistent with the intent of the specific zoning district as specified in Article 6”.

The proposal is consistent with the purpose of the district, which is, “To establish and preserve a district for multi-family residential and other compatible uses which are of particular use and convenience to the residents of the district.”

4. Site and Area Compatibility: The Applicant has to ensure that the project “(i)s designed in a manner that is compatible with the existing natural features of the site and is compatible with the characteristics of the surrounding area, and that the scale, massing and detailing of the buildings are compatible with those prevalent in the surrounding area”.

There are no natural features remaining on the site. The proposal is a three story structure that is most compatible with the development previously approved by the Zoning Board at 96 Prospect Street (ZBA 2013-21).

5. Functional Design: The project must meet “accepted standards and criteria for the functional design of facilities, structures, and site construction.”

The building will function well as residential units. The parking is under the building to maintain the site.

6. Impact on Public Systems: The project will “not create adverse impacts on the public services and facilities serving the development, such as the sanitary sewer system, the storm drainage system, the public water supply, the recreational system, the street system for vehicular traffic, and the sidewalks and footpaths for pedestrian traffic.”

7. Environmental Impacts: “The proposed use, structure or activity will not constitute an adverse impact on the surrounding area resulting from: 1) excessive noise, level of illumination, glare, dust, smoke, or vibration which are higher than levels now experienced from uses permitted in the surrounding area; 2) emission of noxious or hazardous materials or substances; 3) pollution of water ways or ground water; or 4) transmission of signals that interfere with radio or television reception.”

As conditioned, the Applicant will work with City Engineering Staff to comply with all regulatory requirements.

8. Consistency with Purposes: “Is consistent with: 1) the purposes of this Ordinance, particularly those set forth in Article 1 and Article 5; and 2) the purposes, provisions, and specific objectives applicable to the requested special permit with site plan review which may be set forth elsewhere in this Ordinance, such as, but not limited to, those at the beginning of the various sections.”

The proposal is consistent with the general purposes of the Ordinance as set forth under §1.2, which includes, but is not limited to “promoting the health, safety, and welfare of the inhabitants of the City of

Somerville; to conserve the value of land and buildings; and to encourage the most appropriate use of land throughout the City.”

9. Preservation of Landform and Open Space: The Applicant has to ensure that “the existing land form is preserved in its natural state, insofar as practicable, by minimizing grading and the erosion or stripping of steep slopes, and by maintaining man-made features that enhance the land form, such as stone walls, with minimal alteration or disruption. In addition, all open spaces should be designed and planted to enhance the attractiveness of the neighborhood. Whenever possible, the development parcel should be laid out so that some of the landscaped areas are visible to the neighborhood.”

There are no natural features left of the site. The design and landscaping will enhance the attractiveness of the neighborhood.

10. Relation of Buildings to Environment: The Applicant must ensure that “buildings are: 1) located harmoniously with the land form, vegetation and other natural features of the site; 2) compatible in scale, design and use with those buildings and designs which are visually related to the development site; 3) effectively located for solar and wind orientation for energy conservation; and 4) advantageously located for views from the building while minimizing the intrusion on views from other buildings.”

The building is well placed on the lot. It is compatible with the scale in the neighborhood, most homes are 2 ½ or 3 stories. There are no notable views being obstructed.

11. Stormwater Drainage: The Applicant must demonstrate that “special attention has been given to proper site surface drainage so that removal of surface waters will not adversely affect neighboring properties or the public storm drainage system. Storm water shall be removed from all roofs, canopies, and powered area, and routed through a well-engineered system designed with appropriate storm water management techniques. Skimming devices, oil, and grease traps, and similar facilities at the collection or discharge points for paved surface runoff should be used, to retain oils, greases, and particles. Surface water on all paved areas shall be collected and/or routed so that it will not obstruct the flow of vehicular or pedestrian traffic and will not create puddles in the paved area. In larger developments, where practical, the routing of runoff through sheet flow, swales or other means increasing filtration and percolation is strongly encouraged, as is use of retention or detention ponds. In instances of below grade parking (such as garages) or low lying areas prone to flooding, installation of pumps or other devices to prevent backflow through drains or catch basins may be required.”

A condition of this report is that the Applicant will supply a drainage report prior to being issued a building permit summarizing pre and post project conditions.

12. Historic or Architectural Significance: The project must be designed “with respect to Somerville’s heritage, any action detrimental to historic structures and their architectural elements shall be discouraged insofar as is practicable, whether those structures exist on the development parcel or on adjacent properties. If there is any removal, substantial alteration or other action detrimental to buildings of historic or architectural significance, these should be minimized and new uses or the erection of new buildings should be compatible with the buildings or places of historic or architectural significance on the development parcel or on adjacent properties.”

The existing building is not part of Somerville’s historic fabric. The new building is compatible with the ‘preferably preserved’ structure at 96 Prospect street.

13. Enhancement of Appearance: The Applicant must demonstrate that “the natural character and appearance of the City is enhanced. Awareness of the existence of a development, particularly a non residential development or a higher density residential development, should be minimized by screening views of the development from nearby streets, residential neighborhoods of City property by the effective use of existing land forms, or alteration thereto, such as berms, and by existing vegetation or supplemental planting.”

The building will increase the character and appearance of the city. The site will be landscaped and provide green space where there is currently none.

14. Lighting: With respect to lighting, the Applicant must ensure that “all exterior spaces and interior public and semi-public spaces shall be adequately lit and designed as much as possible to allow for surveillance by neighbors and passersby.”

All site lighting will be directed downward without spilling onto adjacent properties and the night sky.

15. Emergency Access: The Applicant must ensure that “there is easy access to buildings, and the grounds adjoining them, for operations by fire, police, medical and other emergency personnel and equipment.”

The building is situated on the lot to allow fire access. The elevated building will help emergency personnel in the case of a medical emergency.

16. Location of Access: The Applicant must ensure that “the location of intersections of access drives with the City arterial or collector streets minimizes traffic congestion.”

The existing curbcut will be closed. A new but smaller curbcut will be opened to access the driveway/garage. This will not change on street parking because there is no parking allowed on the odd side of Prospect Street.

17. Utility Service: The Applicant must ensure that “electric, telephone, cable TV and other such lines and equipment are placed underground from the source or connection, or are effectively screened from public view.”

There is no transformer shown on the site. A standard condition is that any transformer should be located as not to impact the landscaped area, and shall be fully screened.

18. Prevention of Adverse Impacts: The Applicant must demonstrate that “provisions have been made to prevent or minimize any detrimental effect on adjoining premises, and the general neighborhood, including, (1) minimizing any adverse impact from new hard surface ground cover, or machinery which emits heat, vapor, light or fumes; and (2) preventing adverse impacts to light, air and noise, wind and temperature levels in the immediate vicinity of the proposed development;”

The proposal meets the minimum landscaping requirement. The proposed residential building will not result in any adverse impacts beyond activities that are typically associated with residential units. The trash room is in the basement and will not be visible from a public view

19. Signage: The Applicant must ensure that “the size, location, design, color, texture, lighting and materials of all permanent signs and outdoor advertising structures or features shall reflect the scale and character of the proposed buildings.”

There is no signage as part of this proposal.

20. Screening of Service Facilities: The Applicant must ensure that “exposed transformers and other machinery, storage, service and truck loading areas, dumpsters, utility buildings, and similar structures shall be effectively screened by plantings or other screening methods so that they are not directly visible from either the proposed development or the surrounding properties.”

A condition of this report is that transformers and other utility service be fully screened.

21. Screening of Parking:

The parking will be located underneath the building.

III. FINDINGS FOR VARIANCE (SZO §9.5.1.a):

In order to grant a Variance, the Board must make certain findings and determinations as outlined in §5.5.3 of the SZO.

1. There are “special circumstances relating to soil conditions, shape or topography of land or structures which especially affect such land or structures but not affecting generally the zoning district in which it is located, causing substantial hardship, financial or otherwise.”

The building is providing below grade parking to maintain a lawn for the residential units. Requiring a second level of below grade parking to accommodate 14 spaces versus 8 spaces would create a financial burden.

2. The Variance requested is the “minimum variance that will grant reasonable relief to the owner, and is necessary for a reasonable use of the building or land.”

The Applicant is providing 5 new family units which require a higher parking requirement than 1 and 2 bedroom units. By providing one space per unit and putting parking underground relieving the project of the 6 spaces is the minimum amount of relief. While the lot area would support 10 units, the Applicant proposes 7 units. Due to these circumstances, the 8 parking spaces are the minimum relief necessary for reasonable use of this site.

3. “The granting of the Variance would be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of this Ordinance and would not be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare.”

In accordance with the submitted Parking Memorandum, the request for a Variance would not be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental given the low impact that the development would have on the primarily residential neighborhood. Given the RC zoning district, the proposed use is more appropriate for the neighborhood and would be less of a traffic impact than the existing auto use.

The project is located approximately one mile from four T-stations (Harvard Square, Central Square, Lechmere and Sullivan Square stations) and has good access to MBTA bus routes. Several routes are located within ¼ mile of the project site while three routes are within 500 feet. Additionally, the Green Line extension would provide one station within 750 feet and another less than one mile away. While

proximity to transit is one of many factors that contribute to a reduced number of necessary parking spaces, other factors could include density and proximity to a variety of neighborhood services.

III. RECOMMENDATION

Special Permit with Site Plan Review, Special Permit and Variance under §4.1, §7.11.1.c, & §9.5.1.a

Based on the materials submitted by the Applicant, the above findings and subject to the following conditions, the Planning Staff recommends **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL** of the requested **SPECIAL PERMIT with SITE PLAN REVIEW, SPECIAL PERMIT and VARIANCE**.

The recommendation is based upon a technical analysis by Planning Staff of the application material based upon the required findings of the Somerville Zoning Ordinance, and is based only upon information submitted prior to the public hearing. This report may be revised or updated with new recommendations, findings and/or conditions based upon additional information provided to the Planning Staff during the public hearing process.

#	Condition	Timeframe for Compliance	Verified (initial)	Notes														
1	Approval is for a Special Permit with Site Plan Review under §7.11.1.c. to construct seven residential units, a Special Permit under §4.4.1 to substantially alter a nonconforming structure, and a Variance under §9.5.1.a for approx. six parking spaces. This approval is based upon the following application materials and the plans submitted by the Applicant:	CO / BP	ISD/Plng.															
	<table><tr><th>Date (Stamp Date)</th><th>Submission</th></tr><tr><td>July 23, 2013</td><td>Initial application submitted to the City Clerk’s Office</td></tr><tr><td>August 26, 2013</td><td>Modified plans submitted to OSPCD (Plot Plan)</td></tr><tr><td>August 28, 2013</td><td>Modified plans submitted to OSPCD (Civil Site Plan)</td></tr><tr><td>August 27, 2013</td><td>Modified plans submitted to OSPCD (Site Plan, Landscape Plan, Basement Plan, First Floor Plan, Second Floor Plan, Third Floor Plan, Roof Plan,)</td></tr><tr><td>August 7, 2013</td><td>Modified plans submitted to OSPCD (Front Elevation)</td></tr><tr><td>August 27, 2013</td><td>Modified plans submitted to OSPCD (South Elevation, Rear Elevation, North Elevation, Section 1, Section 2, Front View, Front View with Context, Rear View with Context)</td></tr></table>				Date (Stamp Date)	Submission	July 23, 2013	Initial application submitted to the City Clerk’s Office	August 26, 2013	Modified plans submitted to OSPCD (Plot Plan)	August 28, 2013	Modified plans submitted to OSPCD (Civil Site Plan)	August 27, 2013	Modified plans submitted to OSPCD (Site Plan, Landscape Plan, Basement Plan, First Floor Plan, Second Floor Plan, Third Floor Plan, Roof Plan,)	August 7, 2013	Modified plans submitted to OSPCD (Front Elevation)	August 27, 2013	Modified plans submitted to OSPCD (South Elevation, Rear Elevation, North Elevation, Section 1, Section 2, Front View, Front View with Context, Rear View with Context)
	Date (Stamp Date)				Submission													
	July 23, 2013				Initial application submitted to the City Clerk’s Office													
	August 26, 2013				Modified plans submitted to OSPCD (Plot Plan)													
	August 28, 2013				Modified plans submitted to OSPCD (Civil Site Plan)													
	August 27, 2013				Modified plans submitted to OSPCD (Site Plan, Landscape Plan, Basement Plan, First Floor Plan, Second Floor Plan, Third Floor Plan, Roof Plan,)													
	August 7, 2013				Modified plans submitted to OSPCD (Front Elevation)													
	August 27, 2013				Modified plans submitted to OSPCD (South Elevation, Rear Elevation, North Elevation, Section 1, Section 2, Front View, Front View with Context, Rear View with Context)													
Any changes to the approved site plan or elevations that are not <i>de minimis</i> must receive SPGA approval.																		
Pre-Construction																		
2	The Applicant will be required to demonstrate that the updated project plans meet the current City of Somerville stormwater policy. Utility, grading, and drainage plans must be submitted to the Engineering Department for review and approval.	BP	Eng.															

3	The Applicant shall develop a demolition plan in consultation with the City of Somerville Inspectional Services Division. Full compliance with proper demolition procedures shall be required, including timely advance notification to abutters of demolition date and timing, good rodent control measures (i.e. rodent baiting), minimization of dust, noise, odor, and debris outfall, and sensitivity to existing landscaping on adjacent sites.	Demolition Permitting	ISD	
Construction Impacts				
4	The Applicant shall at his expense replace any existing equipment (including, but not limited to street sign poles, signs, traffic signal poles, traffic signal equipment, wheel chair ramps, granite curbing, etc) and the entire sidewalk immediately abutting the subject property if damaged as a result of construction activity. All new sidewalks and driveways must be constructed to DPW standard.	CO	DPW	
5	All construction materials and equipment must be stored onsite. If occupancy of the street layout is required, such occupancy must be in conformance with the requirements of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices and the prior approval of the Traffic and Parking Department must be obtained.	During Construction	T&P	
Design				
6	Applicant shall provide final material samples for siding, trim, windows, and doors to the Design Review Committee for review and comment and to Planning Staff for review and approval prior to construction.	BP	Plng.	
7	An exterior light and electrical receptacle is required for the first (or all) level of the porch and an electrical receptacle is required for the second level (if there is no access to the ground).	Final sign off	Wiring Inspector	
Site				
8	Landscaping should be installed and maintained in compliance with the American Nurserymen's Association Standards;	Perpetual	Plng. / ISD	
9	The electric, telephone, cable TV and other such lines and equipment shall be placed underground from the source or connection. The utilities plan shall be supplied to the Wiring Inspector before installation.	Installation of Utilities	Wiring Inspector	
10	All new sidewalks will be installed by the Applicant in accordance with the specifications of the Highway Superintendent. Specifically, all driveway aprons shall be concrete;	CO	Plng.	
11	Applicant will supply and install 2 U-shaped bicycle racks (that accommodate 2 bicycles each) on the Prospect Street sidewalk.	CO	Plng.	
Traffic & Parking				
12	The Applicant will repaint all pavement markings from the Cambridge/Somerville line to the Prospect/Webster Ave intersection with thermoplastic.	CO	T&P	
13	The Applicant will replace all traffic control signs from the Cambridge/Somerville line to the Prospect/Webster Ave intersection with thermoplastic.	CO	T&P	

Miscellaneous				
14	The Applicant, its successors and/or assigns, shall be responsible for maintenance of both the building and all on-site amenities, including landscaping, fencing, lighting, parking areas and storm water systems, ensuring they are clean, well kept and in good and safe working order.	Cont.	ISD	
Public Safety				
15	The Applicant or Owner shall meet the Fire Prevention Bureau's requirements.	CO	FP	
16	Any transformers should be located as not to impact the historic building or landscaped area, and shall be fully screened.	Electrical permits & CO	ISD	
17	To the extent possible, all exterior lighting must be confined to the subject property, cast light downward and must not intrude, interfere or spill onto neighboring properties.	CO	Plng.	
Final Sign-Off				
18	The Applicant shall contact Planning Staff at least five working days in advance of a request for a final inspection by Inspectional Services to ensure the proposal was constructed in accordance with the plans and information submitted and the conditions attached to this approval.	Final sign off	Plng.	

