

Minutes of the May 6, 2019 Regular meeting of the Planning Board

WELLESLEY PLANNING BOARD

REGULAR MEETING

MONDAY, MAY 6, 2019, 6:30 pm

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, Associate member Sheila Olson (arrived at approximately 6:50 PM).

Staff Present: Interim Planning Director Victor Panak

1. Call to Order

Ms. Johnson called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

2. Public Comments on Matters Not on the Agenda

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

3. 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. Public Hearing - Proposed Amendments to the Zoning Bylaw and Zoning Map for the May 13, 2019 Special Town Meeting - *Continued from April 10, 2019*
 - i. Article 2 – Smart Growth Zoning (40R)
 - ii. Article 3 – Smart Growth Zoning (40R) Map Amendments
 - iii. Article 4 – Residential Incentive Overlay Amendments
 - iv. Article 5 – Yard Regulations Amendment
 - v. Article 6 – Zoning Map Amendment – RIO
 - vi. Article 7 – Zoning Map Amendment – General Residence

vii. Article 8 – Zoning Bylaw Amendment – List of Zoning Districts

Mr. Panak provided summary of the Articles.

Ms. Johnson noted that if Article 2 passes, then Article 3 follows; if Article 2 does not pass, then Article 3 is not necessary.

Mr. Panak detailed that Articles 4, 5, 6 and 7 related to Delanson Circle and the 148 Weston Road project which are two 40B housing projects.

Ms. Johnson mentioned that the intent of the RIO (Residential Incentive Overlay) bylaw is to allow for a greater density than is prescribed by conventional zoning in Wellesley. She noted that if Article 4 does not pass Town Meeting, Articles 5, 6 and 7 are moot. She added that if Article 4 passes, then Articles 5, 6 and 7 have to pass in order to allow Article 4 action.

Mr. Panak explained that Article 8 amends the establishment of districts section of the bylaw to add the commercial recreation overlay district and the smart growth overlay districts to the Establishment of Districts section of the Zoning Bylaw.

Ms. Johnson asked for a motion. Mr. Roberti moved that the Planning Board close the public hearing concerning the zoning articles that will be before the Special Town Meeting - Articles 2 through Articles 8. Ms. Woodward seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously (5-0) to approve the motion.

At 6:44 pm, Ms. Johnson stated that the LHR 19-01 – 26 Oakridge Road would be discussed later in the meeting, in order to hear the Board’s comments on Articles 2 through 8 before Ms. Jop and Selectman Freiman had to depart for the Board of Selectmen meeting.

Ms. Johnson detailed that Mr. Pinto was recusing himself from much of the discussion (Articles 4 through 7) due to his potential connection with the Delanson Circle and 148 Weston Road developer. He will file an appropriate Conflict of Interest Form with the Town Clerk and the Planning Board.

Ms. Woodward stated that she was pleased with how quickly the Town moved forward to fulfill the commitment as set forth in the Unified Plan and the Housing Production Plan and thanked all involved. She indicated that this would be a beneficial outcome for the Town.

Mr. Roberti thanked Ms. Jop and the Board of Selectmen for their efforts, especially in regard to the Wellesley Office Park project as well as thanking Mr. Panak and staff.

Ms. Mallett specifically thanked the neighborhood and their participation in moving these projects forward.

Ms. Johnson agreed with member comments and added that what matters is what is in context and reflects the concept that Wellesley needs to grow in an “evolutionary” way rather than a “revolutionary” one.

Ms. Johnson asked for motions for each of the Articles. Mr. Roberti motioned that the Planning Board support Article 4 – Motion 1 proposed by the Selectmen for Special Town

Meeting for May 13, 2019. Ms. Woodward seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously (4-0) to support the motion.

Mr. Roberti motioned that the Planning Board support Article 5 – Motion 1, for the May 13, 2019 Special Town Meeting. Ms. Woodward seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously (4-0) to support the motion.

Mr. Roberti motioned that the Planning Board support Article 6 – Motion 1, for the May 13, 2019 Special Town Meeting. Ms. Woodward seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously (4-0) to support the motion.

Mr. Roberti motioned that the Planning Board support Article 7 – Motion 1, for the May 13, 2019 Special Town Meeting. Ms. Woodward seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously (4-0) to support the motion.

Mr. Roberti motioned that the Planning Board support Article 7 – Motion 2, for the May 13, 2019 Special Town Meeting. Ms. Woodward seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously (4-0) to support the motion.

Mr. Pinto re-joined the Board at 6:53 p.m.

Mr. Roberti motioned that the Planning Board support Article 2 – Motion 1, for the May 13, 2019 Special Town Meeting. Ms. Woodward seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously (5-0) to support the motion.

Mr. Roberti motioned that the Planning Board support Article 3 – Motion 1, for the May 13, 2019 Special Town Meeting. Ms. Woodward seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously (5-0) to support the motion.

Mr. Roberti motioned that the Planning Board support Article 8 – Motion 1, for the May 13, 2019 Special Town Meeting. Ms. Woodward seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously (5-0) to support the motion.

Ms. Johnson noted that Mr. Pinto should not sign the final Planning Board Report since he was recused. Ms. Woodward indicated that Mr. Pintos' recusion from signing would ensure proper procedure.

b. Consider LHR 19-01 Large House Review for 26 Oakridge Road – *Cont. from April 24*

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.

At 6:56 p.m., Ms. Johnson stated that the LHR 19-01 – 26 Oakridge Road would not be discussed and noted that the project has gone through a series of continuations.

Ms. Olson joined the meeting at 6:58 p.m.

Mr. Panak stated that the applicant submitted notification requesting continuance of the hearing for 26 Oakridge Road to May 20, 2019 meeting. He suggested that the Board vote to continue that public hearing to May 20.

Ms. Johnson queried if the application has gone before the Design Review Board (DRB). Mr. Panak replied in the affirmative and added that there was a change in architects for the project, who did present at the DRB meeting.

Ms. Johnson recommended that the applicant commit to a hearing date if the public hearing is not ready by May 20, as many months have passed.

Mr. Roberti motioned that the Board continue the LHR 19-01 Public Hearing for 26 Oakridge Road to May 20, 2019 with understanding and acceptance by the applicant that the action deadline is also extended to May 20, 2019. Ms. Woodward seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously (5-0) to support the motion.

4. 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 19-06 Large House Review for 44 Ridge Hill Farm Road
- b. Consider LHR 19-06 Large House Review for 14 Strathmore Road
- c. Consider LHR 19-06 Large House Review for 38 Windsor Road
- d. Review and Issue Recommendations for May 16, 2019 ZBA Cases

44 Ridge Hill Farm Road

Present: Attorney David Himmelberger, Greg Stento, Michael McClung, David Betcher, Michael Coutu and Brian Nelson.

Mr. Panak provided related detail and added that DRB approved the project with several recommendations as did the Engineering Division. He added that he had no major issues but there is significant regrading and tree removal proposed and recommended that there be a reduction with tree removal; especially with those trees along the wetlands buffer area and made a recommendation that a different species of tree be planted.

Mr. Himmelberger provided a status update on the project with recommendations included in the final design.

Architect Michael McClung presented details regarding the project and addressed the elevated water table and noted the TLAG stats.

Mr. Roberti asked about proposed building materials.

Ms. Johnson asked about the veneer composite aspect and asked about the wrapping aspect. Mr. McClung stated that copper flashing was being utilized in various areas to bridge the wrap and siding.

Mr. Pinto commented about the shingling.

Ms. Mallett commented about the height of the chimney being excessive. Mr. McClung stated that the height emphasizes the architecture detail.

Mr. Roberti asked how many houses of this style were built by the firm. Mr. McClung responded that his company was known for this particular style.

Ms. Johnson stated the site is beautiful.

Mr. Coutu, landscape designer from Sudbury Design Group, presented the plan and commented that the front yard uplighting was eliminated as suggested by DRB with some uplighting on the back of the house. DRB also recommended less concrete in the courtyard and Mr. Coutu affirmed that the amount of asphalt was decreased by some 560 square feet.

Ms. Johnson confirmed that the displayed plans were the revised ones.

Ms. Mallett commented that the concrete courtyard still appeared huge.

Ms. Woodward stated that she was not in favor of parking courts as displayed and asked why the parking court had to be so large, in consideration of a four-car garage. She added that the garage projected too far forward. Mr. Coutu replied that it was consistent with the size of the house.

Mr. Roberti asked about the total size of the lot and frontage.

Ms. Woodward had questions about the drainage in the parking court and about the vegetation plan. Mr. Coutu detailed that most of the plantings were native species. Ms. Woodward appreciated the list and variety.

Ms. Woodward echoed Mr. Panak's concern about trees.

Ms. Johnson mentioned that trees were being removed between the 50 and 100 foot buffer in order to create a larger yard.

Mr. Pinto asked if the team would be present at the Conservation Commission meeting on Thursday. Mr. Coutu confirmed and asserted that the lawn capacity would not impair the wetland buffer zones.

Ms. Olson asked about the modified regrading.

Ms. Johnson mentioned the benefit of some selected up-lighting and asked about the number of lights in the back yard, which could affect the wildlife there. She added that she wanted to hear the conditions of the Wetlands Commission before voting and stated that she had concerns about lack of planting within the buffer zone and related tree removal.

Ms. Woodward agreed with Ms. Johnson's comments regarding vegetation along the buffer zone and removal of a significant amount of trees and was also in favor of waiting until the next meeting to have such details provided after the Conservation Commission meeting.

Ms. Johnson recommended a more sloping affect in the patio area and commented that the construction plan provided was not a good one in regard to the truck route along Wellesley Square and suggested further recommendation from the Wellesley Police Department.

Ms. Woodward stated that the Planning Board does have a role in preservation of landscape. Mr. Himmelberger commented that the applicant must follow the dictate of the Conservation Commission and did not understand what the benefit of the continuance of the hearing would be.

Mr. Panak stated that Wetlands Committee would control the plans and the applicant would have to come back for revision if the Wetlands Committee so determined and if a major revision was present, the applicant would have to come back before the Planning Board.

Ms. Mallett stated that she wanted to hear more about the drainage aspect of the project and wanted to know what the thoughts of the Wetlands Committee might be.

Brian Nelson, of MetroWest Engineering reviewed the existing conditions plan and referred to the displayed plans. He detailed the drainage methods to be used.

Ms. Johnson queried about fill and related soils.

Discussion took place about the 100 year storm regulations/indicators.

Mr. Roberti noted that DPW signed off on this aspect today and agreed that the drainage system is a workable system.

Ms. Woodward questioned the specific drainage in the parking court. Mr. Nelson provided detail.

Mr. Pinto asked about the proposed groundwater system.

Mr. Nelson stated that the operation and maintenance program would provide inspection of the proposed drainage system twice per year.

Ms. Johnson noted that a larger proposed foundation in order to make the basement waterproof, might affect drainage.

Ms. Woodward asked about storm drain being implemented during construction and queried about the tracking problem. Mr. Nelson explained that there would be a tracking pad at the front of the site. She asked if it was typical to have the wetlands order of conditions in place before voting on a large house review.

Mr. Panak responded that the order of conditions are typically received before Board voting with the large house applications, but not necessarily required.

Ms. Mallett asked about the erosion control fence break.

Ms. Johnson stated that if the Wetlands Commission detects problems with the erosion control system, then the applicant would be required to appear before the Planning Board again; so there is no problem with approving the application with the condition that Wetlands is satisfied.

Mr. Roberti motioned that the Planning Board approve LHR 19-06 for 44 Ridge Hill Farm Road, subject to the normal conditions that are present, and with additional condition that any changes to the project plans that are requested by the Wetlands Committee be deemed a major revision. Ms. Woodward seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously (5-0) to approve the motion.

14 Strathmore Road

Mr. Panak provided details regarding the project and stated that the project has not gone before DRB and expects an extensive list of suggestion from DRB. He recommended that the Planning Board vote to continue the hearing to the next meeting.

Mr. Roberti motioned that the Board continue the hearing on May 20, 2019. Ms. Mallett seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously (4-0) to approve the motion.

38 Windsor Road

Present: Pete Holland, Laura Holland, Tim Power, Rebecca Bachand, Craig and Allie Pfannenstiehl.

Mr. Panak summarized the project and explained that the project has received approval from DRB with several recommendations. The Engineering Division determined that the proposed stormwater management system was satisfactory and recommended that the applicant consider LID techniques as an alternative, and today the Engineering Division approved revisions with one minor outstanding aspect, which the Board could include as a condition of approval if the Board approves the project at this meeting. Mr. Panak had some concern related to landscaping, regrading, tree removal and light fixtures. He mentioned that the applicant's volume and choice of plantings is excellent.

Developer, Mr. Holland, stated that he purchased the property January 1, 2019 and the lot presented slopping challenges. Mr. Holland provided detail regarding the project.

Ms. Bachand, Landscape Architect, described the proposed landscape plan.

Ms. Johnson inquired about the retaining wall distance from the critical root zone. A related discussion continued.

Tim Power, Civil Engineer for the project, provided detail on the site and related mitigation measures.

Ms. Johnson mentioned that currently there is runoff into the street. Mr. Power stated that there might be some runoff from the roof in a 100-year storm or larger.

Mr. Roberti asked why the garage could not be flipped and he found it to be rather imposing. Mr. Holland responded that suggestion was seriously considered and DRB preferred this rendering.

Ms. Johnson asked if the plan went to the Historical Commission to obtain the waiver for demo review. Mr. Holland responded that had been postponed.

Ms. Johnson stated that the Historical Commission recommended that the garage be turned around in keeping with the other homes in the Abbott Road area. She indicated that she appreciated the architectural detail and suggested that the eyebrow window be made smaller.

Ms. Woodward commented that she did not see a difference in grade when examining the garage. Mr. Holland noted that the change in grade would be apparent if the garage were turned. Ms. Woodward agreed with member concerns regarding the placement of the garage and indicated that there was an excessive amount of pavement. Mr. Holland replied that the team worked to minimize the pavement and if the garage were turned, there would be more pavement.

Mr. Pinto asked what the setback is of the adjacent houses. Ms. Johnson stated that adjacent houses were setback 42 and 46 feet.

Mr. Pinto asked about the square footage of the house. Mr. Holland replied that some space was lost in the TLAG and square footage is 6,000 square feet on the first and second floor, in keeping with the neighborhood.

Mr. Roberti commented that this house would be the largest on the street.

Ms. Mallett inquired about the roof height. She added that the shielding of the garage was preferable over some of the other houses in the neighborhood.

Ms. Woodward asked if the pine trees were being kept.

Mr. Panak commented that there was no labeling of the proposed oak trees. Mr. Holland offered to provide the hard copy detailing the oak trees.

Ms. Johnson stated that the Board received communication from a neighbor, Marla Robinson who spoke of preservation of landscape, scale of building, predominance of the three-car garage, lighting and lack of open space.

Ms. Johnson recognized neighbors in the audience.

Resident Nancy Westenberg, 50 Windsor Road, asked about the vegetation being planted near the wetlands. Ms. Bachand detailed the proposed plantings while referring to the landscape plan and stated that the growth will remain around the slope and pointed out the new ground cover near the wetlands and existing slopes will remain untouched. Ms. Westenberg asked about the operation and maintenance plan.

Ms. Johnson suggested conditioning the maintenance aspect.

Resident Michael Frank, 46 Windsor Road, thanked the developers for their outreach and commented about potential noise from the air conditioning and outdoor stereo music around the patio area. He added that he would be in favor of keeping the garage as it is.

Ms. Johnson recommended screening any potential ac noises with additional plantings. Mr. Holland stated that he was happy to provide additional plantings and stated that the newer ac units are quieter.

Ms. Westenberg commented about establishment of new vegetation canopy and suggested larger trees/bushes/plantings.

Ms. Johnson replied that the Board could ask the applicant to consider installation of four inch diameter (DBH) trees. Mr. Holland detailed that the NRC meeting suggested that as well. Sheet flow was another aspect that Ms. Westenberg mentioned. Mr. Power addressed the concern.

Ms. Westenberg asked about implications of a prospective owner making changes to the property. Ms. Johnson replied that changes would necessitate approval by the Planning Board, if major in nature and that staff would be involved, if a minor change took place.

Ms. Woodward added that a major change would require abutter notification. Mr. Panak stated that notice is required for any neighbor within 300 feet of the property. Ms. Westenberg had further comment about drainage off the driveway.

Mr. Roberti queried about lighting in the front of the house which is not dark sky compliant.

Ms. Johnson asked about the two flood lights over the garage and suggested that they be eliminated and shield the entrance lantern lighting.

Ms. Johnson suggested continuance of hearing for lighting modifications, and a rendering showing the trees that are being kept in the front of the property.

Mr. Roberti motioned to continue the hearing for Large House Review – 38 Windsor Road to May 20, 2019. Ms. Woodward seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously (5-0) to approve the motion.

Mr. Panak officially outlined the requested items: remove flood lights, make changes to the light fixtures to be dark sky compliant, copy of Order of Conditions if issued on Thursday and update to the Operation and Maintenance Plan to include maintenance procedures for the pervious patio.

d. Review and Issue Recommendations for May 16, 2019 ZBA Cases

170-184 Worcester Street and 7 Burke Lane

Mr. Panak provided update on these two projects and noted that both involve substantial re-grading of land and removal of vegetated cover greater than 5000 square feet. Staff recommends approval of 170-184 Worcester Street.

Ms. Johnson mentioned that there is very limited landscaping at 7 Burke Lane and therefore the Board should not be recommending approval until plans are revised.

Ms. Woodward commented on the grading of the site.

Ms. Johnson suggested that ZBA require a parking ratio analysis.

Mr. Roberti motioned that ZBA request that the applicant withdraw without prejudice, or provide the following conditions: more detail on retaining walls, information on parking spaces proposed than are required, improve pedestrian circulation, especially connectivity between the north site and the south site and add more landscaping/compliance with the development standards of Section 21 and use of LID best practices. If applicant would not be willing to make these changes, denial would be recommended. Ms. Woodward seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously (5-0) to approve the motion.

Sprague Field Tennis Court Replacement

Mr. Panak provided review of the project and recommended ZBA approval.

Ms. Johnson announced that Mr. Roberti recused himself.

Ms. Woodward motioned to recommend to the Zoning Board of Appeals that they approve Case #DRB – 19-15M and ZBA 2019-49 Wellesley Tennis Court Reconstruction. Ms. Mallett seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously (4-0) to approve the motion.

5. Old Business

- a. Discuss Board Reports and Recommendations for May 13, 2019 Special Town Meeting

Ms. Johnson announced that the Board reports would be submitted by Friday a.m.

Mr. Roberti had question about Ms. Johnson's notes. Ms. Johnson clarified the notes made.

6. Other Business

Ms. Johnson mentioned that interviews for Planning Director have been cancelled.

- a. Review and Consider Approval of FY20 Planning Board Meeting Calendar.

Mr. Panak noted that staff made a mistake regarding scheduling a meeting during the holiday. Ms. Johnson mentioned that the only conflicting date is the March 2nd meeting as Town Affairs Night is scheduled.

Mr. Roberti motioned that the Board accept the FY20 Planning Board Meeting Calendar with change of March 2, 2020 meeting to March 4, 2020. Ms. Woodward seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously (5-0) to approve the motion.

- b. Consider Reappointment of Design Review Board Members.

Mr. Roberti motioned that the Board appoint Mr. Amir Kripper as an alternate member whose term ends June, 2020. Ms. Iris Lin to serve as Mr. Krippers replacement, whose term ends June 30, 2021 and moves that Ms. Juann Khoory serve on the Design Review Board as a regular member starting a new term to end July 30, 2022. Ms. Johnson added amendment to thank Ingrid Carls for her many years serving on the Design Review Board. Ms.

Woodward seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously (5-0) to approve the motion.

c. Discuss Possible Rezoning and Redevelopment of Wellesley Gateway (93 Worcester Street)

Mr. Panak provided update to include 150 housing units and would aim for the 25% affordable housing threshold with 40R classification.

Mr. Pinto questioned if this site was the Harvard Pilgrim Building. Mr. Panak affirmed.

Ms. Johnson stated that from a traffic standpoint the location is favorable but there was a development agreement that precludes residential housing.

Mr. Panak commented that the preclusion aspect would be amended as part of this process.

Mr. Pinto suggested that office space might be the preferred usage at that site.

d. Planning Director's Report

Mr. Panak stated that the Planning Director Interviews would take place at the May 20th meeting and interviewing for the part-time planning position would take place next week.

e. Planning Board Chair Report

Ms. Johnson informed the Board that she received two petitions from various people in Wellesley asking the Planning Board to help name certain streets and, intersections for famous women. She noted that the Planning Board does not handle that type of action and suggested forwarding the correspondence to Ms. Jop and the Board of Selectmen.

Ms. Johnson noted that Associate Planning Board member, Sheila Olson, has agreed to extend her term for another two years. Ms. Johnson stated that further related discussion would take place at the May 20th meeting.

There being no further business, Ms. Johnson adjourned the meeting at 10:12 p.m.

Next Meeting: Monday, May 20, 2019

Minutes Approved: Monday, June 3, 2019