



**Vice Chair**  
Vacant

**Voting Members**  
Antonio Reynoso  
Franklyn Veloz  
Brenda Rozzi

**Associate Voting Member**  
Betty Camilo-Correa

**Administrative  
Assistant**  
Jorge O. Martinez

**Land Use Planner**  
Daniel A. McCarthy

**PLANNING  
BOARD**

**LAWRENCE  
MASSACHUSETTS**

**CHAIR**  
Tamar Kotelchuck

**LAWRENCE PLANNING BOARD**  
**PUBLIC MEETING/HEARING**

**Thursday, May 14th, 2020 at 6:00 PM**

Due to the COVID-19 outbreak and the policy changes made by Governor Baker and Mayor Rivera, this meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals was preformed remotely.

LAWRENCE PLANNING BOARD

Minutes to the Meeting/Hearing

Roll Call:

Tamar Kotelchuck, Chair-Present  
Brenda Rozzi-Present  
Betty Camilo-Correa-Present  
Antonio Reynoso-Present  
Manny Nunez – Present (late arrival)

Also Present:

Jorge Martinez, Minute Taker-Present  
Daniel McCarthy-Present  
David Palumbo-Present  
Michael Armano-Present

***Upon a motion made by Mr. Reynoso and seconded by Ms. Rozzi, the board unanimously decided to open the public meeting.***

***576 Haverhill Street  
Coanabo Grullon***

Mr. Grullon stated that he was before the board in order to change the zoning on his property from an R-2 residential zoning district into a Highway Access zoning District. He stated that if this were to be done his business would be able to secure a retail license to sell cars rather than the wholesale license he has now. The applicant then stated that his repair shop is in the rear of the building. He then added that the building is an industrial park with a multitude of uses. He also added that he and his colleagues could fit up to 100 cars on the lot if they were parked properly. He added that the hours of operation would be 8am-5pm and that there would be no noise after that time.

Mr. Reynoso then asked the applicant if there was sufficient lighting in the area. Mr. Grullon stated that the streetlights automatically go on at 7:00pm. Ms. Kotelchuck then wanted to know what the zoning in the area was. Mr. Grullon stated that the area is an R-2 residential zoning district.

Mr. McCarthy then stated that the property as it is being used is over utilized. He then added that the uses on the property do not fit the zoning of the neighborhood. He then added that the Highway Access (HA) district was primarily made to act as a catalyst for development along Routes 110, 114, and 495. He then added that HA is the only district that allows for the sale of used cars by right, which is why the applicant may be attempting to seek the zoning change. Mr. McCarthy then stated that the proposal is clearly spot zoning and changing the zoning of the area would not only allow the sale of used cars, but alcohol as well.

Ms. Kotelchuck then asked how many lots would be affected by the zoning change. Mr. McCarthy stated that just the lot where Mr. Grullon's shop is located would be affected.

***Upon a motion made by Mr. Reynoso and seconded by Ms. Rozzi, the board unanimously decided to open the public hearing.***

Ms. Kotelchuck stated that although there may not be anyone present, there was an abutter that opposes the proposal that corresponded with her via email.

The e-mail reads:

Chairman Tamar Kotelchuck:

I don't think the proposed zoning change of 576 Haverhill Street (R-2) to a Highway Access District (HA) will benefit the surrounding families, the neighborhood tiny-tot playground, the ball field(Gagnon Park), the Bruce School or the gym/auditorium next door at 580 Haverhill St. owned by the Lawrence Housing Authority.

576 Haverhill Street already seems saturated with a busy convenience store, a car repair shop, another car repair shop, an inappropriately sited 90 ft. cell tower, and multiple cars coming & going, or parked, waiting to be serviced at Haverhill St/Community Ave.

The actual highway (I-93) is two miles away to the west along Haverhill St. Please consider turning this proposal down. Thank you kindly, Joan McCarthy. 4 Bicknell Ter.

The applicant then stated that the other repair shop that is on the lot does not park their cars correctly.

***Upon a motion made by Mr. Reynoso and seconded by Ms. Rozzi, the board unanimously decided to close the public hearing.***

Ms. Kotelchuck stated that she has many concerns regarding changing the zoning. She stated that the area is mainly residential, but if that changed then the residents of the area could be subject to many changes, even billboards. She stated that the use is inappropriate and so is the location.

Ms. Rozzi stated that the proposal is very clearly spot-zoning. Mr. Reynoso agreed.

Mr. McCarthy then stated that the board could only provide a recommendation to the City Council. He then added that the board could send the City Council a positive recommendation, negative recommendation or no recommendation at all.

With no further discussion,

***The board voted and the results are as follows:***

***Tamar Kotelchuck, Chair-No***

***Antonio Reynoso-No***

***Brenda Rozzi-No***

***Betty Camilo-Correa-No***

***Manny Nuñez-No***

***The Lawrence Planning Board decided to send the City Council a negative recommendation regarding the zoning change.***

Mr. Grullon then stated that it would be hard to envision the zoning change without seeing the property; He then stated that he might consider leaving the city because Lawrence is a bad place to run a business.

***6-12 Springfield Street  
Raymond Vasquez***

Present to address the board were Frank Giles and Raymond Vasquez.

Mr. Giles had stated that the property known as 6-12 Springfield Street had been burned down by a fire and that his client wishes to rebuild the property and make some upgrades. He stated that the home would be a six family. He added that there would be parking in the rear of the building.

Mr. Giles then showed some designs of similar looking houses around the city and stated that the home that he is designing would look the same. He then stated that there would be some differences, but for the most part they would look very similar.

Ms. Kotelchuck then asked what the unit sizes would be. Mr. Vasquez stated that they would be 720 square feet. Ms. Kotelchuck then stated that 720 square feet is a tad small. Mr. Giles then stated that the trash would be kept in the rear of the building.

Ms. Camilo-Correa then asked if 720 square feet per unit was in the state guidelines. Ms. Kotelchuck stated that there are no specific guidelines, but rather recommendations set forward by the state. She said that according to these recommendations the units, as they stand, would be a bit small. State guidelines for a 2 bedroom unit are 850 sf.

Mr. McCarthy then stated that the city has no position on the proposal. He stated that a departmental review had been done and he and the rest of the city officials present had agreed that the project would bring forward some positive change in the area. He then stated that the home would have to be constructed and built abiding by the current building and safety codes which would make the building and the area safer. He then stated that there would be improved access from the rear of the building and that there would be no logical reason to deny this request. It was then added that the building would be structurally similar, therefore it would not need a variance.

***Upon a motion made by Mr. Reynoso and seconded by Ms. Rozzi, the board unanimously decided to open the public hearing.***

***Upon a motion made by Mr. Reynoso and seconded by Ms. Rozzi, the board unanimously decided to close the public hearing.***

Ms. Kotelchuck then asked the other members if they had any questions or concerns.

Ms. Rozzi stated that she would like to approve the proposal.

Ms. Kotelchuck then stated that she believes that the plans are inadequate. She asked if there was a landscape plan. Mr. Giles stated that he and his colleague would be more than willing to provide a landscape plan. Ms. Kotelchuck then asked if it would be possible for Mr. Giles to provide the board with renderings of the property as well. She stated that merely viewing pictures of other homes would not be enough to justify a decision. Mr. Giles stated that he would be able to do that as well. He then stated that the appearance would be very similar to the old building that existed before the fire.

Ms. Kotelchuck just wanted to assure that the area looks attractive.

Mr. Vasquez then stated that the lack of detailed plans was because the process of review by the Planning Board would change many aspects of the project.

Ms. Kotelchuck proposed the following conditions to the applicant:

1. Applicant must submit a landscape plan for approval by Land Use Planner.
2. Applicant must submit renderings of the property, for approval of acceptable outside appearance by Land Use Plan.

Mr. Nuñez then asked what the units were before the fire. Mr. Giles stated that they were two-family units. Mr. Nuñez then asked if it would be possible to increase the size of the units. Mr. Giles stated it would not be feasible without extending the footprint of the building.

Mr. McCarthy then suggested making a condition that the applicant would need to install bay windows, which would help make the units seem bigger. Ms. Kotelchuck then stated that this condition would help maximize the size of the units.

Mr. Vasquez then asked if a porch could be considered as living space. Mr. Palumbo and Mr. McCarthy stated that it would not be.

Ms. Kotelchuck then suggested that the board accept the petition with the conditions that were presented.

With no further discussion,

***The board voted and the results are as follows:***

***Tamar Kotelchuck, Chair-Yes with the conditions***

***Antonio Reynoso-Yes with the conditions***

***Brenda Rozzi-Yes with the conditions***

***Betty Camilo-Correa-Yes with the conditions***

***Manny Nuñez-Yes with the conditions***

***The applicants petition was unanimously approved.***

***9-11 Dana Street***

***Eric Artlies***

Present to address the members of the board was Marcos Devers. He stated that he was before the board in order to secure a Special Permit for a substantial addition.

He stated that the addition would be a 45% addition and that the property has plenty of parking to support the addition. He then stated that the applicant would like to incorporate the attic into the addition as well and that the applicant would like to add value to the home and make it so that his family can grow into the home. He then stated that the home is located in an R-2 residential zoning district and has safe methods of egress.

Ms. Kotelchuck then asked if the appearance of the home from the outside would change. Mr. Devers stated that it would not. Ms. Kotelchuck then stated that the appearance of the home would have to change if the roof of the room is being raised. She then asked which side was being raised. Mr. Devers stated that both sides were being raised.

Mr. Devers stated that the look would appear to be similar throughout the neighborhood.

*Upon a motion made by Mr. Reynoso and seconded by Ms. Rozzi, the board unanimously decided to open the public hearing.*

*Upon a motion made by Mr. Reynoso and seconded by Ms. Rozzi, the board unanimously decided to close the public hearing.*

Mr. McCarthy then stated that the city has no objection to the proposal, he then suggested that a condition be made that the applicant set the dormer back from the edges of the home to keep the appearance of all of the homes in the area consistent. Mr. Devers then stated that his applicant would be willing to do that.

With no further discussion,

*The board voted and the results are as follows:*

*Tamar Kotelchuck, Chair-Yes with the condition  
Antonio Reynoso-Yes with the condition  
Brenda Rozzi-Yes with the condition  
Betty Camilo-Correa-Yes with the condition  
Manny Nuñez-Yes with the condition*

*The applicants petition was unanimously approved.*

*0 Showell Court and 7 Showell Court  
Miguelin Contracting Inc., 289 Essex Street, Lawrence MA*

Present to address the members of the board was Frank Giles.

He stated that the lot where the project is taking place used to be a city owned lot. He stated that there would be four units, each with 1,400 square feet. He stated that from the street the buildings will appear to be two floors, but the dormers in the back will give ample space to the third floor and keep the appearance consistent.

Ms. Kotelchuck stated that she likes the design, and appreciates the improvements since the last version.

Mr. McCarthy stated that the city is in favor of the proposal.

Mr. Giles stated that the units will be for rentals and would need their own private trash contract. Mr. McCarthy stated that a condition should be put into place that the applicant submits a refuse plan that will be reviewed by the city.

*Upon a motion made by Mr. Reynoso and seconded by Ms. Rozzi, the board unanimously decided to open the public hearing.*

*Upon a motion made by Mr. Reynoso and seconded by Ms. Rozzi, the board unanimously decided to close the public hearing.*

With no further discussion,

*The board voted and the results are as follows:*

*Tamar Kotelchuck, Chair-Yes with the condition  
Antonio Reynoso-Yes with the condition  
Brenda Rozzi-Yes with the condition  
Betty Camilo-Correa-Yes with the condition  
Manny Nuñez-Yes with the condition*

*The applicants petition was unanimously approved.*

*65 Jackson Street  
Jony Perez*

*Upon a motion made by Mr. Reynoso and seconded by Ms. Rozzi, the board unanimously decided to continue the matter.*

*9 Morton Street  
Nelson DeLaCruz*

*Upon a motion made by Mr. Reynoso and seconded by Ms. Rozzi, the board unanimously decided to continue the matter.*

*62-64 Hancock Street  
Elsa Tejada*

*Upon a motion made by Mr. Nuñez and seconded by Ms. Camilo-Correa, the board unanimously decided to continue the matter.*

*Upon a motion made by Mr. Reynoso and seconded by Ms. Camillo-Correa, the board unanimously decided to adjourn the public meeting.*