

WELLESLEY DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 19, 2019; 6:30 PM
GREAT HALL, WELLESLEY TOWN HALL

Members Present: Vice-Chair Rob Skolnick, Sheila Dinsmoor, Juann Khoory, Iris Lin, Ingrid Carls (arrived approximately 6:35 p.m.)

Staff: Catherine Johnson, Planning Board Chair, facilitating

Also Present: Jason Parillo, Paulette Nicolliello, James Heroux, James Duffey, Karl Tucker, Myra Tucker, Katherine Chute, Joseph Skoruper, Bill Doyle, David Himmelberger, Mitchell Kassler, Thomas Trykowski, Dave Hickey

1. **Call to Order:** *Mr. Skolnick called the meeting to order at approximately 6:30pm.*
2. **Public Comments on Matters Not on the Agenda.** No one spoke on any matters.
3. **New and/or Continued Applications**

DRB 19-26 S: The Shade Store, 180 Linden Street -- Signage

Documents:

- Signage Application
- Tenant Sign Package
 - Cover Sheet
 - Comprehensive Package Details
 - Exterior Site Plan and Key Plan
 - Exterior Elevations
 - Exterior Primary Identification
 - Exterior Section Details
 - Exterior Typical Permanent Graphics
 - Exterior Typical Permanent Signs
- Cover Letter from Back Bay Sign with repeat of Tenant Sheets above, color coded:
 - Exterior Site Plan and Key Plan
 - Exterior Elevations
 - Exterior Primary Identification
 - Exterior Section Details

All documents from the Board meeting are on file in the Planning Office.

Discussion: Jason Parillo of Back Bay Sign presented the project and explained that the location of the store had two entrances, one on Linden Street and one on the parking lot side. There would be two identical signs, each with halo lettering on a background that had a halo effect. He described that signs that neighboring stores had in comparison.

Ms. Lin asked about the sizes of these signs. Mr. Parillo said that the Divine Design sign was actually longer, but that the sign for The Shade Store fit nicely within the sign band.

Motion: Having no other issues to discuss, Mr. Skolnick moved to approve the application as presented. Ms. Dinsmoor seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously to pass the motion (4-0).

DRB 19-27 M: Sun Life, 96 Worcester Street – Major Construction

Documents:

- Major Construction Application
- Park 9 Entrance Modifications
 - Cover Page
 - Description of Project
 - Site Utilities Plan
 - Fusion Park 9 Entrance Cover Sheet
 - Exterior Entry – Rendering
 - Exterior Entry – Plan
 - Exterior Entry – Reflected Ceiling Plan
 - L-2 Planting Plan
 - Lighting Cut Sheets (4 pages)
- Park 9 – Worcester Street, Proposed New Entrance Design
 - Current Condition, Proposed Design, Exterior Entry Reflected Ceiling Plan, Exterior Entry Plan
 - Landscape Site Plan
 - Existing Conditions (photographs)
 - Precedent Imagery
 - Precedent Imagery
 - L0.0 Existing Condition Plan
 - L1.0 Materials and Grading Plan
 - L2.0 Landscape Planting Plan
 - L3.0 Landscape Elevations
 - L4.0 Landscape Details
 - L4.1 Landscape Details

All documents from the Board meeting are on file in the Planning Office

The applicants distributed updated packages with some additional information to the Board members. Paulette Nicolliello (property manager for Sun Life Executive Park, now known as Park9), James Heroux (landscape architect, Copley Wolff), and James Duffey (architect, Fusion Design Consultants) introduced themselves.

Ms. Nicolliello explained that Sun Life was downsizing and giving up a couple of floors. This project will create a new entrance for Building 96 that is more prominent, with a new entrance doorway and new stairs. She also said that there would need to be a new

accessible ramp at this entrance as the former ADA access to Building 96 was through Building 100, a connection that would no longer exist with the downsizing.

Mr. Duffey said that the architectural changes were quite simple. He described the new entrance canopy and lighting under the canopy and indicated that there would be no signage on the canopy.

Mr. Heroux described the accessible ramp and said that the reason it led to the right was to get people to Building 100, where the Cafeteria was, and to the Center Courtyard, which was designed and opened last year. He said that the intent was to turn a bunker-like entry into something that had a grander stair. The ramp is approximately 80 feet long, made of a sand-finished concrete, and will have a wall of stone to reflect the entrance created by Fusion Design Consultants.

Board Discussion: The Board questioned and discussion a number of details about the architecture and landscaping.

Ms. Dinsmoor ascertained that the railing was to be stainless rather than bronze.

Ms. Lin asked whether the sand paving on the ramp continued onto the entry landing under the canopy [No, because the porch is existing and directly above programmable space so it cannot be disturbed.] She expressed concern that there would be two different materials on the landing, that the new pavers at the top of the ramp would seem to be a banding, that this was narrow, and that the entire entry landing should be one material. She asked if the look – the materials – could be simplified.

Ms. Lin said that there were also too many materials used on the walls for the ramp and the stairs, that some walls were stone while others were concrete. She asked that the applicant reconsider these materials, perhaps just picking one.

Ms. Carls said that she felt stone would be best because of the way concrete ages, noting that there would be a noticeable difference between the concrete of the original building and any new concrete used for these walls.

Ms. Khoory asked a technical question about drainage from the canopy. [The canopy will be pitched to the left – as you look at the entrance – with an internal drain in the 4 FT feature wall.] She also asked why the stairway was angled towards the left, away from the parking. Mr. Heroux said that because of the grading and the length of the ramp, orienting the stairs to the right would have pinched the landing and made it too small. He also said that they were going to be shifting the position of the stairs somewhat in order to center the landing on the doors.

Ms. Lin said that the applicant might be able to shift the ramp to the right as well.

Motion: Hearing no other comments, Mr. Skolnick moved to approve the design with the following alterations:

1. Make the front wall of the ramp stone so it ties into the other walls.
2. Shift the handicapped ramp towards the right to make the landing area larger.
3. Re-examine the material used for the new portion of the landing to be concrete or pavers that would noticeably different [from the concrete]. Mr. Skolnick indicated that this was not part of the motion.
4. Verify that the drainage from [the canopy] would be consistent on the left-hand side.

Ms. Carls seconded the motion. The Board approved the motion unanimously (5-0).

Revisions are to be submitted to the Planning Department for review.

LHR 19-10: 43 Kenilworth Road, Myra Tucker – Large House Review

[Taken out of Agenda Order]

Documents:

Plans and Documents

1. Large House Review Application Form, received May 2, 2019 with Statement of Intent
2. TLAG Affidavit, dated May 9, 2018
3. Survey and Lot Coverage Information by John R. Hamel, PLS dated April 29, 2019, on TOW Residential Building Permit
4. Cover letter and statement of intent, prepared by Thomas P. Catalano, AIA, dated May 2, 2019
5. Large House Review Submittal, prepared by Catalano Architects, Inc., dated May 2, 2019
 - LHR Cover Sheet
 - C-1.00 43 Kenilworth Rd. Addition and Site Improvements, Drainage and Grading Plan by DEI
 - C-2.00 43 Kenilworth Rd. Addition and Site Improvements, Site Details by DEI
 - LH 0.1 Tucker Residence, 43 Kenilworth Rd. Neighborhood Delineation Plan
 - LH 0.2 Tucker Residence, 43 Kenilworth Rd. Existing Neighborhood Photos
 - LH E.1 Tucker Residence, 43 Kenilworth Rd. Existing Building Conditions and TLAG
 - LH E.2 Tucker Residence, 43 Kenilworth Rd. Existing Site Conditions
 - LH 1.0 Tucker Residence, 43 Kenilworth Rd. Proposed Basement Floor Plan and TLAG Calculations
 - LH 1.1 Tucker Residence, 43 Kenilworth Rd. Proposed First Floor Plan/ TLAG
 - LH 1.2 Tucker Residence, 43 Kenilworth Rd. Second Floor Plan/ TLAG
 - LH 1.3 Tucker Residence, 43 Kenilworth Rd. Tucker Residence, 43 Kenilworth Rd. Attic Plan/ TLAG
 - LH 1.4 Tucker Residence, 43 Kenilworth Rd. Proposed Roof Plan
 - LH 2.1 Tucker Residence, 43 Kenilworth Rd. Proposed North Elevation
 - LH 2.2 Tucker Residence, 43 Kenilworth Rd. Proposed East and South Elevations
 - LH 2.3 Tucker Residence, 43 Kenilworth Rd. Colored Elevations

- L0.01 43 Kenilworth Rd., Wellesley, Massachusetts Site Prep and Demolition Plan by Gregory Lombardi Design, Inc. dated May 2, 2019
 - L1.00 43 Kenilworth Rd., Wellesley, Massachusetts Site Landscape Plan by Gregory Lombardi Design, Inc. dated May 2, 2019
 - L1.01 43 Kenilworth Rd., Wellesley, Massachusetts Site Grading Plan by Gregory Lombardi Design, Inc. dated May 2, 2019
 - L1.02 43 Kenilworth Rd., Wellesley, Massachusetts Grading Front Plan by Gregory Lombardi Design, Inc. dated May 2, 2019
 - L1.03 43 Kenilworth Rd., Wellesley, Massachusetts Grading Plan Rear by Gregory Lombardi Design, Inc. dated May 2, 2019
 - L1.04 43 Kenilworth Rd., Wellesley, Massachusetts Planting Plan – Front by Gregory Lombardi Design, Inc. dated May 2, 2019
 - L1.05 43 Kenilworth Rd., Wellesley, Massachusetts Planting Plan – Rear by Gregory Lombardi Design, Inc. dated May 2, 2019
 - L1.06 43 Kenilworth Rd., Wellesley, Massachusetts Photometric Lighting Plan by Gregory Lombardi Design, Inc. dated May 2, 2019
 - L1.07 43 Kenilworth Rd., Wellesley, Massachusetts Lighting Plan – Front by Gregory Lombardi Design, Inc. dated May 2, 2019
 - L1.08 43 Kenilworth Rd., Wellesley, Massachusetts Lighting Plan – Rear by Gregory Lombardi Design, Inc. dated May 2, 2019
 - L1.09 43 Kenilworth Rd., Wellesley, Massachusetts Lighting Specifications by Gregory Lombardi Design, Inc. dated May 2, 2019
 - L1.10 43 Kenilworth Rd., Wellesley, Massachusetts Site Details by Gregory Lombardi Design, Inc. dated May 2, 2019
6. Existing Conditions Plan, 43 Kenilworth Road, Wellesley, Massachusetts Verne T. Porter Jr., PLS September 1, 2017
 7. Proposed Conditions Site Plan, 43 Kenilworth Road, Wellesley, Massachusetts Verne T. Porter Jr., PLS November 27, 2018
 8. Landscape & Lighting Plan, 43 Kenilworth Road, Wellesley, Massachusetts March 26, 2019, revised 4/1/2019 and 6/19/2019
 9. Lighting cut sheets, Bevolo Gas & Electric Lights
 10. Tree Inventory and Management Plan, Tucker Residence by Bartlett Tree Experts, April 2018
 11. 43 Kenilworth Rd. Construction Management Plan June 19, 2019
 12. Post Construction Stormwater Management Report by Doyle Engineering Inc. dated May 2, 2019
 13. Email from Jeannette Rebecchi, 43 Kenilworth DRB Approval, dated March 28, 2019
 14. Emails supporting project from Lois Lee, Nancy Gilbert, David Mooney and Kristen Curtin

All documents from the Board meeting are on file in the Planning Office.

Mr. Skolnick asked the applicants to join the Board at the table to present their project. Myra and Karl Tucker [owner] said that they were making changes to their property, including creating a three-car garage, to fit the changing needs of their family. Ms. Tucker added that she had reviewed their plans with most of their neighbors. She then introduced their design team, Katherine Chute (architect), Joseph Skoruper (landscape designer), and Bill Doyle (engineer), who presented the project to the Board.

Discussion:

Ms. Chute said that the only addition to the square footage of the house will be the third bay of the garage and the master bedroom above it; that there would be no basement. She said that the new windows will be casement to match the ones on the existing part of the buildings and that there would be a few architectural features added to the entryway.

Mr. Skoruper said that there were three parts to the landscaping plan: (1) altering the driveway to allow access to the third bay and providing turning space to allow for better circulation; (2) simplifying the front walkway; and (3) expanding the rear patio of the house with potentially adding an outdoor kitchen.

Mr. Doyle said that there was an existing underground infiltration system. He said that the run-off from the new impervious additions to the house [garage, patio, front walkway] would flow into that system and that the connections to that system would be improved. He added that the size of the system would also be increased.

Ms. Lin said that she thought that near the front staircase and the adjacent planting area, there would need to be an additional drain installed.

Mr. Skolnick asked if there was a new curb cut and requested, if possible, a reduction in the width of the curb cut.

Motion: Mr. Skolnick, hearing no further discussion, asked for a motion. Ms. Khoory make the motion to approve as presented with the addition of a drain added near the front staircase/planting bed. Mr. Skolnick seconded the motion. The Board approved the motion with its recommendation unanimously (5-0).

DRB 19-28 M: EP 14 Mica Lane Realty, LLC, 14 Mica Lane – Minor Construction

Documents:

- Application for Minor Construction
- Construction Drawings
 - Cover Sheet: Existing Façade[s]
 - Plot Plan
 - Façade and First Floor Partition Plan
 - Façade (Elevations and Renderings)
 - Façade (New Exterior Elevations)
 - Façade (New Exterior Renovations)

- Rear Elevation and New Renderings)

All documents from the Board meeting are on file in the Planning Office.

Mr. Skolnick asked the applicants to join the Board at the table. Attorney David Himmelberger, representing EP 14 Mica Realty, LLC, introduced Mitchell Kassler [owner] and Thomas Trykowski [architect].

Mr. Trykowski explained that the scope of the project included changes to the front façade, parking area, and door/lighting changes to the rear of the building (primarily for safety and security).

Mr. Trykowski said that the existing front walkway was not accessible as there was a step up at the door. The proposal is to make the walkway a sloping 1:20 walk to a level landing; this would necessitate repaving in the parking area. He said they would be painting the brick the same gray as 16 Mica and introducing a stainless steel screen system to wrap the corner of the front and side facades. At the rear, Mr. Trykowski explained the change to the door and said that there would be the same stainless screening used over some existing louvers.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Skolnick verified that there would be a canopy added to the rear door; and at the front as well. Ms. Carls asked about the material used for the canopy [aluminum].

Members of the Board discussed a proposed illuminated sign on a knee wall near the beginning of the sloping walkway. Mr. Skolnick said that the applicant should look into whether the sign needed a special permit from the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA). Mr. Skolnick suggested that the Planning Department verify that the sign was compliant.

Ms. Khoory suggested that the mesh should be used more extensively on the rear of the building to match what was being done on the front, carving around the doorway instead of just covered the louvers. Ms. Khoory suggested that the lighting at the rear be evenly spaced. Ms. Khoory also asked about the drainage from the front canopy and was told that it would be internal, behind the screen.

Ms. Lin questioned the grading as shown on the renderings and asked that the project's civil engineer look to simplify it, possibly adding curbing to the walkway to allow the parking area to be lower and level. Ms. Lin also discussed the planters and whether the placement of two would create a more symmetrical design. Ms. Lin expressed a concern that the sign knee wall could impede cars backing out of the parking area.

Ms. Carls referenced a planter near the door and was told by Mr. Trykowski that it would hold anneals, changed seasonally.

Motion: Hearing no other call for discussion, Mr. Skolnick moved to approved the minor construction project as presented with the following recommendations:

1. Add mesh screening to the rear more extensively to cover the entire rear facade.
2. Re-address the rear light fixtures so they are spaced evenly
3. Verify that the site plan creates even sloping in the parking area that provides appropriate drainage.
4. Verify through the Planning Department that the sign is compliant with the Sign Bylaw and does not need ZBA approval.
5. The sign/knee wall position should be asymmetrical to complement and correspond to the asymmetrical mesh on the front façade.

Ms. Lin seconded the motion. The Board approved the motion with recommendations unanimously (5-0).

DRB 19-30 M: Hunnewell Fields, 438 Washington Street (Town of Wellesley) – Major Construction

Documents:

- Application for Major Construction
- Written description of the Project
- Project Design Site Drawings dated March 26, 2019:
 - C1.00 Cover Sheet
 - L0.00 General Notes
 - L1.00 Overall Site and Existing Conditions Plan
 - L1.01 Existing Conditions Plan – Enlargement – Lee Field
 - L1.02 Existing Conditions Plan – Enlargement – Hunnewell Field
 - L2.01 Site Preparation Plan – Enlargement – Lee Field
 - L2.02 Site Preparation Plan – Enlargement – Hunnewell Field
 - L3.01 Materials Plan – Enlargement – Lee Field
 - L3.02 Materials Plan – Enlargement – Hunnewell Field
 - L4.01 Grading Plan – Enlargement – Lee Field
 - L4.01-c Grading Plan – Enlargement – Lee Field
 - L4.02 Grading Plan – Enlargement – Hunnewell Field
 - L5.01 Planting Plan – Enlargement – Lee Field
 - L5.01-a Planting Plan – Enlargement – Lee Field
 - L5.01-b Planting Plan – Enlargement – Lee Field
 - L5.01-c Planting Plan – Enlargement – Lee Field
 - L5.02 Planting Plan – Enlargement – Hunnewell Field
 - L6.00-L6.06 Site Construction Details
- Drawing Renderings by Weston & Sampson

All documents from the Board meeting are on file in the Planning Office.

As the 57 River Street applicant was not yet present, Mr. Skolnick asked Mr. Hickey, from the Engineering Department, to join the Board at the table and explain the Hunnewell project.

Mr. Hickey began by giving the background of this project. He said that the impetus was the recognition that Lee Field, which is where the girls' softball teams play, was

not on par with the other fields at the Hunnewell complex. He said that there were no dugouts and that drainage was only average. Approach to the field was either from the other fields, or along the Aqueduct, or across a small footbridge that is over a drainage channel. Mr. Hickey said that the biggest hurdle is that the right field depth is about 2 or 3 feet short of MIAA regulation.

Mr. Hickey said that the goals of the project are to raise the standard of the field and to improve ADA access, add dugouts and scoreboards, and add hydration stations. Mr. Hickey explained that in order to pick up the 2-3 feet in right field, the DPW would culvert the drainage channel and put in a water treatment system for the storm water; that would allow the field to slide towards the tennis courts, picking up the footage shortfall.

Mr. Hickey further explained that at Lee Field, there would be an LED solar-powered scoreboard along the third baseline, backing to Washington Street. It would be simple, with just innings, balls, strikes, etc. called out. Mr. Hickey said that there would be no night games at Lee. At the Hunnewell Field, however, the existing scoreboard is electrified and mounted to a light pole. It will be switched to one that also uses LED lights, but Mr. Hickey noted that the new scoreboard will be programmable and more complicated because the multi-purpose field hosts different sports with different scoring needs.

Mr. Hickey then explained the bleachers and other accessory structures on the multi-purpose field were moveable to accommodate the various sports played there; that the dugouts would be pre-fabricated and encased in a block-faced brick. The roof will be a standing-seam metal roof. He also described the storage sheds and field accessibility.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Skolnick asked whether moving Lee Field closer to the tennis courts would necessitate a taller backstop so balls wouldn't hit tennis players. Mr. Hickey said that the backstop for Lee Field is straight while the backstop for the multipurpose field is cantilevered at its top. Ms. Lin asked how tall the backstops are. Mr. Hickey said that both were 30 FT tall.

Ms. Lin asked about the material used for the accessible walkways. Mr. Hickey said that coming down from Washington Street, which has a 4-degree slope, the material would be asphalt. Mr. Hickey later explained that the asphalt was impermeable because the walkways were a little curvilinear. In other areas, the material would be the compacted stone dust that is used on the Fuller Brook path. Ms. Lin also asked whether the space in front of the bleachers also met the ADA accessibility standards.

Mr. Skolnick asked about the interpretive panels [signage]. Mr. Hickey explained that these would resemble what are in place on the Fuller Brook path.

Ms. Lin asked about the scoreboard on Lee Field, that the back of the scoreboard faced Washington Street. It was noted that if the scoreboard faced away from Washington Street for driver safety, perhaps the back of it could be screened with landscaping. Ms. Lin verified that the dugouts would be a brick [color] and that the roof color for the dugouts would be either black or dark brown.

Mr. Hickey explained that the fencing would be black vinyl-covered chain link and that the roof on every structure would be black. Ms. Dinsmoor reflected on the design for the buildings at the track and field, which, as Mr. Hickey pointed out, matched the brick of the high school and included a similar capstone.

Ms. Khoory asked whether having the arches on the dugouts would be cost effective and whether there was a precedent. Mr. Hickey said that the arches were meant to relate to the dugouts on Reidy Field, which is adjacent to the multi-purpose field.

There was a brief discussion of the potable and non-potable irrigation systems. Mr. Hickey also noted that the water stations would be a dark green that would match others in town.

Ms. Carls asked whether there was any change to the lighting. Mr. Hickey said that lighting could be addressed in a few years, which would align with the DPW capital budget, but that there were numerous changes in the technology that made it impractical to address now. He said that the lights are timed and remotely served.

Motion: Hearing no other call for discussion, Mr. Skolnick asked for a motion. Ms. Khoory moved that the design be approved as presented with the following recommendations:

1. The ADA accessibility is confirmed for the pathway from the road to the field in terms of slopes and materials.
2. The articulation of the façade of the dugouts should involve consideration of rectangular openings vs. arched ones.
3. The roof of each dugout should be black (or dark brown), consistent with the Town standard on the Hunnewell complex.

Ms. Dinsmoor and Ms. Carls seconded the motion simultaneously. The Board voted to approve the motion with recommendations (5-0).

DRB 19-29 M: 57 River Street, Wayne F. Smith for J.T. White Properties, 57 River Street – Minor Construction

Documents:

- Application for Minor Construction
- Cover Letter from John H. LaFreniere AIA on the scope of the project
- Aerial View of 57 river Street
- C-1 Site Plan (no changes proposed)
- Street view from east and west

- Photographs of entrance from parking lot and Approach from site entry
- Photographs of building entrance from driveway
- Proposed Entrance Renderings
- A8 Existing and Proposed Elevations
- A7 Street and Parking Lot Elevations (no change)
- River Place Lobby Stair Renovation
 - Cover Sheet
 - A-1 Plans and Elevations
 - A-2 Elevations and Details

All documents from the Board Meeting are on file in the Planning Office.

Noting that the applicant for 57 River Street did not come to the hearing and recognizing that the modifications to the entrance included full-depth glass panels that seemed to be an improvement to the façade, Mr. Skolnick asked the Board if they wanted to approve the application without the applicant present.

Ms. Dinsmoor said that she had no problem with the modifications. Other Board members agreed.

Motion: Mr. Skolnick then moved to approve the application for 57 River Street as presented. Ms. Dinsmoor seconded the motion. The Board voted approval unanimously (5-0).

4. Design Guideline Handbook Update – Discussion:

This item was not discussed.

5. Adjourn: *Mr. Skolnick took a moment to recognize and thank Ms. Carls for her many years of work on the Board. All members said that each would miss her commentary, but wished her a wonderful move. Ms. Johnson thanked her on behalf of the Planning Board.*

Having no other business, Mr. Skolnick made a motion to adjourn. Everyone seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously (5-0) to adjourn the meeting at 8:25.

Next Meeting: July 17, 2019

Minutes Approved: August 13, 2019

Minutes compiled by:
Catherine Johnson, Planning Board Chair