

Minutes of the April 3, 2019 Regular Meeting of the Planning Board

WELLESLEY PLANNING BOARD

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 3, 2019, 6:30 P.M.

TOWN HALL – GREAT HALL

MINUTES

The Planning Board guides the Town of Wellesley in preserving and enhancing Wellesley's quality of life by fostering a diverse housing stock, multi-modal transportation options, valuable natural resources, resilient infrastructure, and a thriving local economy. The Planning Board achieves these goals through the creation and implementation of Zoning Bylaws, policies, long-term planning and by promoting citizen participation in the planning process.

Planning Board Present: Chair Catherine Johnson, Vice-Chair Jim Roberti, Secretary Kathleen Woodward, Patricia Mallett, Frank Pinto and Associate Member Sheila Olson.

Staff Present: Interim Planning Director Victor Panak

1. Call to Order

Ms. Johnson called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Ms. Johnson announced that an Advisory Board meeting was going on this evening as well, and the Board would take a recess and continue the meeting at the Advisory Committee since Planning Board articles would be discussed.

2. Public Comments on Matters Not on the Agenda

There were no public comments on matters not on the agenda.

3. Presentation - Delanson Circle & 148 Weston Road

Materials distributed to, and considered by the Planning Board regarding this agenda item are retained with the official set of minutes available at the Planning Department Office.

Present: Victor Sheen, Owner; Peter Holland

Wellesley Square Residences at Delanson Circle

Mr. Sheen referenced overhead slides when describing the Wellesley Square Residences. He detailed that the intention was to demolish the five existing buildings on Delanson Circle and create a 35-unit building. He stated that the existing two buildings on Hollis Street would remain.

Mr. Holland referred to the project renderings and stated that sidewalk improvements would be made and provided detail regarding the placement of structures in consideration of site grading. He spoke of parking provision, garages, visitor parking and proposed access for emergency vehicles. Mr. Holland mentioned that landscaped roof gardens would be incorporated for vegetation only.

Mr. Holland acknowledged that transitioning from a 40B development to a condo development would provide richer quality of landscaping materials and the implementation of a courtyard.

Ms. Johnson questioned if this development would have a PSI consideration, should it be approved by Town Meeting. Mr. Panak answered in the affirmative, adding that the design review process would be included.

Ms. Johnson inquired about the roof level at the corner of the building at Hollis and Linden Street. Mr. Brown responded that it is 43 to 44; pending final grading.

Ms. Johnson asked if the condos would be market rate and asked about age restrictions. Mr. Sheen responded that the proposed project reflects 35 market-rate units and two existing buildings on Hollis street would have four affordable units to be renovated and sold. Ms. Johnson asked if the mentioned designation was included in a Development Agreement. Mr. Sheen responded in the affirmative. Mr. Sheen added that currently there is no age restriction.

Mr. Roberti asked if the renovated building units would be part of the main condo development or separate. Mr. Sheen replied that the four units would be part of the condominium association and because the valuation of the affordable units is less; the percentage of ownership would be considerably less.

Mr. Roberti queried about the parking ratio. Mr. Sheen affirmed a 2.0 ratio with 63 parking spaces in the garage and 10 exterior spaces, with no stackers.

Mr. Roberti asked if everything had been worked out with the neighbors. Mr. Sheen responded positively and detailed an executed Memorandum of Understanding had been forwarded to the Board of Selectmen. Ms. Johnson asked if the Town would be responsible for enforcement if the development team did not meet the terms of that agreement. Mr. Sheen detailed that the Memorandum of Understanding is an agreement between two private parties specifying elements of the development and what the neighborhood will support. He said that the conditions of the Agreement expect to be in writing and submitted to the appropriate Boards as part of the permitting process.

Mr. Holland explained that there would be a full fencing around the development and low level lighting. He detailed the drainage/stormwater aspects were met and affirmed that emergency vehicle clearance was adequate.

Mr. Roberti inquired about Engineering Department approval. Mr. Sheen confirmed that under the 40B process, the Engineering Department was in agreement.

Ms. Johnson inquired about the timeline if Town Meeting approved the development in May. Mr. Sheen responded that the PSI process would begin shortly after Town Meeting approval. Ms. Johnson recommended that such process wait until the Attorney General examines the vote.

Mr. Pinto asked if there were any plans for solar installation at the site. Mr. Sheen responded that currently there were no such plans. Mr. Holland commented that the main consideration regarding solar is the height of the building relative to the abutting structures on the rear and it would take some discussion with abutters. Ms. Johnson stated that a shadow study would indicate viability of solar.

Ms. Woodward asked if the HVAC utilities would be housed on the roof. Mr. Holland responded that the condensers would be located at the center of the building with acoustic screening.

Ms. Woodward noted that green roofs can be difficult to maintain and might encourage leaking. She asked if there was a maintenance plan in place for the roof. Mr. Holland responded that assurances were provided to the abutters that it would not be a private deck situation. He added that movable trays would be installed on the roofs.

Ms. Mallett commented about a particular photo presented. Mr. Holland stated that the photo is not a rendering of what would be built, but rather a display of material and design that would be used for the development.

Ms. Woodward questioned if the courtyard would be open to the public. Mr. Sheen replied that the courtyard would run as does the courtyard at Belclare and would not be a publicly accessible courtyard in consideration of security maintenance. Mr. Holland added initially when the plan involved a five-story 40B project, there was an area of public access. Ms. Johnson queried if the private use would include the four units on Hollis Street. Mr. Sheen responded in the affirmative. Ms. Johnson inquired if the owners of the affordable units be allowed access to all association amenities. Mr. Sheen responded that those owners would be able to use all offered amenities. Mr. Holland asserted that the goal is to improve Hollis street with additional public benches, full-street improvement and working with the Westerly Road residents.

Wellesley Park Residences

Mr. Holland mentioned that the Wellesley Park Residences would have similar approach as the Wellesley Square Residences. He stated that his group is working closely with the existing homeowners. Referencing the overhead slides, Mr. Holland presented proposed design renderings reflective of 25 residential units. He explained that the project would include 56 parking spaces, a 2.1 parking ratio, with provision for handicapped parking as well.

Mr. Pinto asked if the project included affordable units. Mr. Sheen replied positively and stated that 140 Weston Road would be the affordable unit and the current owner has been there for over forty years and a life-estate structure will be in place for her and later would be added to the rest of the proposed units.

Ms. Woodward asked about 140 Weston Road. Mr. Sheen responded that 140 Weston Road is a lot at this time. He added that there is an existing home at 144 Weston Road. Ms. Woodward commented regarding preservation of the historic home.

Mr. Roberti asked if Ms. Orser's house would be donated to the Town once vacated. Mr. Sheen responded plans are to be worked out; adding that the commitment is to increase the affordable housing stock.

Ms. Mallett asked about the number of affordable housing units at the site. Mr. Sheen replied that currently it is the single unit described and later consideration be given to the redevelopment of potentially two units but would not be established before the expiration of the life estate unit. Ms. Johnson asked if these aspects are memorialized in the Development Agreement. Mr. Sheen responded affirmatively.

4. Discuss Board Reports, Recommendations and Presentations for 2019 Annual Town Meeting Zoning Articles

Mr. Panak summarized the considered Planning Board Articles:

Article 30 – A Town Meeting member identified some issues with the motion and the article was tabled and not voted on. Mr. Panak added that agreed upon changes were made to the motion such as renumbering of articles 26A and 29. Mr. Panak commented that the motion would probably come back to Town Meeting on Monday for a vote and tonight the Board would have to vote on the amendment to the motion and the Advisory Committee would need to vote on the amendment as well. The other issue raised in regard to Article 30 is the severability piece and he provided detailed.

Article 31 – The Off-Street Parking Bylaw. Mr. Panak stated that the article was passed at Town Meeting.

Article 32 – Outdoor Lighting Bylaw. Mr. Panak stated that there was much discussion and a Town Meeting member identified several issues with the article. Mr. Panak explained that he provided changes to the article in regards to language consistency. The next issue raised concerned luminaires greater than 1,000 feet from a property line being exempt. Mr. Panak read the language that he and Town Counsel agreed upon. He stated that the last request from a member of Town Meeting involved light fixtures needing a special permit and added that the ZBA can make finding that the proposed lighting is “necessary for recreational and athletic activities conducted on land used for municipal or educational uses.” He noted that this had particular relevance to the High School field lighting. Mr. Roberti commented that the educational uses of such lighting would apply to the colleges in Town also. Ms. Johnson stated that a question might be to run this by the Chairman of ZBA to assure that this is what that Board would need. She noted that codification could be applied between now and 2025, as necessary. Mr. Panak indicated that if a special permit was needed for the High School field lights, the ZBA could make the finding that lighting would be necessary to enhance public safety.

Mr. Panak detailed that a typo in the redlined version of the Zoning Bylaw was discovered and he then updated the Article with Town Clerk. Ms. Johnson commented that 250 copies would have to be provided for all three of the revised motions. Mr. Panak informed the Board that the Town Clerk suggested sending an e-mail to all Town Meeting members regarding the three article changes, per Board recommendation. Ms. Johnson was in agreement.

Ms. Woodward stated that she had some concerns regarding G.1.a and mentioned related confusion at Town Meeting last night about security/emergency call boxes and she questioned if the language was “security light and emergency call boxes” or “security call boxes.” Mr. Panak responded that it is “call boxes” and lumen associated with security is too broad and the focus is specifically the lighting over the security call boxes. Ms. Mallett commented about eliminating “security” because everyone knows what emergency call boxes are. Mr. Panak agreed with the elimination of the word “security.”

Ms. Woodward commented about temporary construction lighting not being temporary seasonal lighting. Mr. Panak responded that construction lighting is not permitted lighting and the lighting involved with this bylaw is lighting that is part of the construction project and not the construction activity. Related discussion continued.

Ms. Woodward stated that she wanted to take some time to review the new section D language and wanted sections C and D be connected because there are those who believe that the lighting on the high school field is necessary at night and there are those who believe that it is not necessary and could be dependent on whether it produces high unacceptable glare, sky glow...etc.

Ms. Olson stated that she preferred that the language remain as it is because of the special permit aspect and much is based on resident input. Ms. Olson asked about the definition of “luminary” in consideration of section D and applicability. She questioned if the language of “luminaries” and “installation” provide enough information regarding permanent lighting. Mr. Panak responded that the language indicates the intention.

Ms. Woodward suggested that section D be presented to NRC because it is a substantial change and has been a somewhat controversial issue and wanted to ensure that those wanting to provide input would have enough time to do so. Related discussion continued.

Ms. Woodward stated that she hoped that ZBA would not approve anything that “produces unacceptable light trespass, glare, sky glow or compromise privacy of abutting owners.” Mr. Panak stated that public safety would always override “unacceptable light trespass.”

Mr. Roberti moved that the Board amend the motion for Article 29 – Motion 1 to make the redline change from February 27, 2019 to April 3, 2019. Ms. Woodward seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously (5-0) to approve the motion.

Mr. Roberti moved that the Board amend Article 30 – Motion 1 – to re-number Section XXVIA Notice for Public Hearings as Section 26; re-numbering Section XXIX – Interpretation as Section 27. Ms. Woodward seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously (5-0) to approve the motion.

Mr. Roberti moved that the Board amend Article 32 – Motion 1 – Section 1A, remove the word “security” and “/” and remove from Section G the word “the” and include the words “unless exempt above, the,” and move that Section H remove the word “or” to the end of Section 2 to H2c. Move to add proposed Section H to D, which reads: “the proposed lighting is necessary for recreational or athletic activities conducted on land used for municipal or educational uses.” Ms. Woodward seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously (5-0) to approve the motion.

5. Continued/Previous Applications and/or Public Hearings

Materials distributed to, and considered by the Planning Board regarding this agenda item are retained with the official set of minutes available at the Planning Department Office.

- a. Consider LHR 19-07 Large House Review for 11 Pilgrim Circle – *Cont’d from March 18, 2019*

Present: Brian Charles Alim, of Architectural Design Services and Mr. Dan Garrison, Owner

Mr. Panak stated the Board requested some changes with the architecture and light fixtures and the Engineering Department determined that the stormwater management is adequate and requested some minor revisions to the plan. He added the applicant had addressed almost all the Engineering Department’s comments. Mr. Panak suggested that the remaining concerns could

be addressed by a conditional approval which would indicate that the final plans submitted must include all revisions/requests by the Engineering Division.

Mr. Panak detailed that the architectural changes made by the applicant reflected change to the garage dormer, lighting and utilization of wire fencing for tree protection. Mr. Panak indicated that no changes were made regarding a permeable driveway nor the silt sacks.

Mr. Garrison said that he was unclear about the silt sacks. Ms. Johnson commented that it was suggested due to the brook along the left side of the house. Mr. Roberti asked if the Engineering Dept. had any concerns about silt sacks. Mr. Panak responded not. Ms. Woodward mentioned her concerns during the construction phase and noted that much disturbance of soils with equipment that silk sacks should be used as preventative measures. Mr. Garrison stated that he is already incorporating silt socks and fencing. Ms. Woodward recognized the noted silt protections were sufficient.

Ms. Woodward complimented the applicant on the interesting design of the home, particularly in the back of the house.

Mr. Roberti moved to approve LHR 18-17 Large House Review for 11 Pilgrim Circle subject to satisfaction of e-mailed points by George Saraceno in his e-mail of March 7, 2019 and conditions outlined by staff report. Ms. Woodward seconded the motion. It was on motion one abstain and four in favor. Ms. Mallett recused herself from voting due to her absence at the last meeting.

- b. Consider LHR 19-01 Large House Review for 26 Oakridge Road – *Cont'd from March 18, 2019*

Mr. Panak stated that the applicant requested continuance of hearing to the next meeting.

Ms. Woodward commented that the Board received no materials regarding 26 Oakridge Road. Mr. Panak confirmed that the Board had not received such materials. He detailed that the project was approved by DRB last week.

Mr. Roberti moved to continue LHR 19-01 Large House Review for 26 Oakridge Road to the April 24, 2019 meeting with the understanding that the applicant has accepted the change in the action deadline to April 24, 2019. Ms. Woodward seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously (5-0) to approve the motion.

- c. Discuss Chapter 40B Application for Preliminary Site Eligibility at 136-140 Worcester Street and Town's Response Letter.

Mr. Panak stated that there have been no changes since the Town's Response Letter and the action deadline is April 12, 2019. Mr. Panak stated that comments from the Board have to be incorporated into the letter and Executive Director Meghan Jop and Town Counsel are preparing additional pieces to the letter to address the issue.

5. New Applications and/or Public Hearings

Materials distributed to, and considered by the Planning Board regarding this agenda item are retained with the official set of minutes available at the Planning Department Office.

a. Consider LHR 19-03 Large House Review for 24 Carisbrooke Road

Present: Michael Tartamella, AIA with Patrick Ahearn Architect; Brian Nelson, P.E. of MetroWest Engineering, Inc.; Mike Coutu, Landscape Architect of Sudbury Design Group.

Mr. Tartamella provided an overview and update of the proposed project and noted the TLAG is approximately 6,300 square feet. He detailed that there were a number of additions put on the house over the years and the proposal is to bring the house back to the 1936 main house style/character, which is in keeping with the original scale of the home. He explained the historical character of the proposed materials to be used. He addressed the lighting aspect.

Mr. Coutu explained that much change will take place in the back of the house. He noted that there is much existing screening in the back of the house including a large Norway Spruce and added that the majority of the development is in the northwestern corner of the lot. He stated that additional screening would be added to the north boundary line. He explained that the driveway layout is almost identical to what is there now with the exception of the parking court which services the additional garage bay. He detailed that there are 53 trees on the property and there is a proposal to remove nine of those trees. He detailed most of the trees to be removed are small and insignificant and would not withstand the construction process.

Ms. Johnson asked about the diameter of the replacement trees. Mr. Coutu indicated that the caliper would be four inches.

Mr. Nelson stated that presently there are no stormwater controls onsite so a subsurface infiltration system is being proposed located south of the house. He noted that there will be significant decrease in runoff ranging from 50% to 35% for the two-year storm thru the hundred year storm, in terms of runoff rate. He stated that the team responded to the letter from George Saraceno in Engineering and received favorable result.

Ms. Johnson commented about the tree lighting proposed and stated that trees with attached lighting do not respond well over time and suggested that the team come up with a better solution. Ms. Johnson stated that she would research and provide similar applied solutions.

Mr. Pinto stated that he went by the site and noted a tree with large bumps on it. He wondered if that tree was to remain. Mr. Coutu responded that the tree is a mature beech tree and would be remaining and commented on its beauty. Ms. Woodward thanked everyone for preserving the natural landscape.

Ms. Johnson stated that she was pleased with the massing of the proposed house.

Ms. Mallett asked about the purpose of the barn. Mr. Courtu replied that the applicant would be expanding storage/landscaping space as the owner is a veterinarian and wanted a storage area for supplies for the family dogs.

Mr. Roberti moved that the Board approve LHR 19-03 Large House Review for 24 Carisbrooke Road subject to the normal conditions as stated in the staff report. Ms. Woodward seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously (5-0) to approve the motion.

Ms. Johnson stated that the meeting would be suspended because the Board was now to attend the Advisory Committee meeting. She noted that the Planning Board meeting would be continuing at the Advisory Committee meeting.

The Planning Board returned to the Great Hall.

b. Consider LHR 19-04 Large House Review for 8 Riverdale Road

Present: Attorney David Himmelberger of Wilder, Shea & Himmelberger, LLP; Michael Collins, Architect of D. Michael Collins Architects; Richard Cohen of WKC Sudbury Crossing, LLC, owner

Mr. Himmelberger stated that property TLAG is currently 3,990 and went through demolition review adding the Historical Commission approved the waiver application. He stated that the Design Review Board was complementary about the project and did provide suggestions. DRB suggestions included:

- Reducing the driveway width to no more than 12 feet
- Reducing the driveway slope
- Creating an access point from the driveway to the back yard
- Submission of a tree protection plan

Mr. Himmelberger commented that the applicant agreed to the DRB suggestions. He noted that a memo from the Town Engineering Department was issued on March 21, 2019 which indicated approval of the stormwater management plan and requested some minor alterations. A response has been submitted to the Engineering Division.

Mr. Collins stated that the modest design of the proposed home is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood and would be replacing a house that is approximately 2,000 square feet. He noted that the proposed home is in compliance with all setbacks and the current home is not. He mentioned a large oak tree located in the front corner of the lot, predicated the location and design as rendered. Mr. Collins detailed that a retaining wall would be retained and improved and many larger trees would remain as well. He noted that nine or ten trees would be removed and are mostly saplings growing wild.

Mr. Collins mentioned that all the proposed light fixtures are dark sky compliant, shielded and down-lit. The owner Mr. Cohen, has likely engaged a buyer who would like to make several changes and the applicant is in the process of making those changes which includes an extended garage for storage, which is an addition of 97 square feet as well as adding 42 square feet to the mudroom. He further detailed that on the second floor the Master Bedroom has been expanded to include a shed dormer. He suggested that those changes be coordinated with the changes that the Engineering Department is recommending. He proposed presenting those alterations to the Board at a continued hearing.

Ms. Johnson asked about the timeline for completion of those changes. Mr. Collins stated that he would hope to submit those plans to Victor by next week.

Ms. Johnson asked about height and reconstruction of the existing retaining wall. Mr. Collins replied that the wall is four to five feet high. Ms. Johnson asked if DRB commented on the wall. Mr. Collins affirmed that the proposed work to the wall would be restorative and

not reconstruction. Mr. Himmelberger noted that the retaining wall was on the lot line and because it is a pre-existing, non-conforming structure, it is there and would not be changed but would be restored.

Ms. Mallett asked about changing the pitch in the driveway. Mr. Collins responded that fill was not being removed, but being spread out.

Ms. Johnson inquired about the ridge height of the home. Mr. Collins stated that the height was 28 feet and 3 inches.

Ms. Woodward asked about protections during construction and expressed concerns about stormwater management. Mr. Himmelberger detailed that the property is outside of the buffer zone. Ms. Woodward suggested utilization of silt sock or silt sack during the construction period.

Mr. Himmelberger inquired about the Engineering Department's request regarding milling and paving of utility trench. Mr. Panak responded that the milling and paving should encompass the width of the roadway.

Mr. Himmelberger distributed renderings which highlighted the proposed revisions to the original plans. Mr. Collins provided narrative of the proposed revisions. Mr. Himmelberger reiterated that the total TLAG (with proposed renovations to the original plans) would be increased to 4,256 square feet.

Ms. Johnson commented that the addition of dormers would aid in breaking up the mass of the building.

Ms. Woodward noted that it was very refreshing to see such a plan and appreciated the structure itself and the care given to the preservation of the tree. Board members agreed.

Ms. Johnson mentioned that the character of the proposed home fit with the character of other residences on Riverdale Road, which is a special neighborhood.

Mr. Roberti motioned to continue the public hearing for LHR 19-04 Large House Review for 8 Riverdale Road to address the outstanding Engineering concerns and submission of new plans to the April 24, 2019 meeting. Ms. Woodward seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously (5-0) to approve the motion.

6. *Review of Adequacy for 6 Pinevale Avenue – Confirm Satisfactory Completion of Required Work and Consider Release of Escrow.*

Mr. Panak explained that a Review of Adequacy reflects the construction of a new house on a non-public way and this is a method of assuring that the roadway in front of the property is adequate to enable municipal services to the property. He noted that the property went through the Review of Adequacy process with all associated work completed. Mr. Panak added that Town Engineer, George Saraceno, indicated that the paving was not completed to standard (which involves paving the full width of the roadway). He noted that the original agreement did not clearly specify the standard.

Ms. Johnson commented that she hoped that people will learn from this example.

Mr. Roberti mentioned that assurances must be put in place in order that such results are not repeated.

Mr. Roberti motioned to release the escrow that is being held by the Town in the amount of \$8,498.00 to MadMoeJoe, LLC. Ms. Woodward seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously (5-0) to approve the motion.

7. Old Business (Cont'd)

Discuss Special Town Meeting and Zoning Articles on Wellesley Office Park, Delanson Circle and 148 Weston Road

Mr. Panak provided status summary of the three projects:

Wellesley Office Park

Mr. Panak emphasized that the Planning Board is creating a new section (40R) to the zoning bylaw which has not changed since it was submitted to DHCD (Department of Housing and Community Development) in February. He reviewed the details of the 40R District Zoning and explained how Board members can access the 40R – “Smart Growth Overlay Districts Zoning” attachment on the Town website.

Mr. Panak commented that there is one change to the SGOD (Smart Growth Overlay Districts) that the Board will have to make and is also awaiting comments from DHCD regarding zoning, which is anticipated by next week.

Mr. Roberti queried if that mentioned change is internal. Mr. Panak confirmed that it was and stated that he spoke to a DHCD representative who stated that the Town’s application is complete and is now being reviewed. He explained that DHCD is aware of the given time constraints and acknowledged the Town’s request for expediting the zoning piece of the application.

Mr. Roberti asked Ms. Johnson what might happen if DHCD comments are not received before the related public hearing. Ms. Johnson responded that she would have to confer with the Board of Selectmen chairman and Town counsel regarding that aspect. She indicated that an extra week before Town Meeting would have helped greatly with this situation.

The public hearing considerations and zoning aspects were discussed.

Mr. Roberti asked if there was a prepared warrant. Ms. Johnson and Mr. Panak confirmed that there was a warrant which is online.

Ms. Johnson noted that some Town Meeting members have concerns regarding the three addressed Development Agreements and worry that they may not be approved at Town Meeting. Ms. Johnson referred to the Wellesley Office Park Development Agreement recalling that the Linden Street Square Development Agreement included clause that the developer had to come back before Town Meeting for any changes made during the entire course of development. Ms. Johnson mentioned several possible identification corrections for consideration within the Wellesley Office Park Development Agreement.

Ms. Woodward commented about the change in unit number from 350 to 345. Mr. Panak acknowledged that aspect and stated that the change would have to be addressed by the Board.

148 Weston Road

Mr. Panak stated the Board must consider the changes to the Residential Incentive Overlay District (RIO) which Mr. Panak distributed to the Board. Mr. Panak presented the general RIO concept and changes to the RIO that would make the two projects conforming. He suggested that the Board review the changes before the public hearing next week.

Delanson Circle

Mr. Panak mentioned that the Delanson Circle project is a more simple process and is a matter of re-zoning the related properties.

Mr. Pinto commented with re-zoning there would not be enough aggregate to further propose another large project within the mentioned RIOs. Mr. Panak agreed.

Ms. Johnson spoke about the naming of buildings/signage and mentioned the Ardmore Building and Hastings Village, commenting about the related implication/stigma of signage identifying such residential buildings. She wondered if such naming signage was necessary in residential communities in Wellesley. Mr. Roberti added that such signs would be very small according to Executive Director Jop.

There being no further business, Ms. Johnson adjourned the meeting at 10:33 p.m.

Next Meeting: April 24, 2019

Minutes Approved: August 19, 2019

Victor Panak, Interim Planning Director