



ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

TOWN HALL • 525 WASHINGTON STREET • WELLESLEY, MA 02482-5992

RICHARD L. SEEDEL, CHAIRMAN
J. RANDOLPH BECKER, VICE CHAIRMAN
DAVID G. SHEFFIELD

LENORE R. MAHONEY
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
TELEPHONE
(781) 431-1019 EXT. 2208

ROBERT W. LEVY
WALTER B. ADAMS
DEREK B. REDGATE

March 1, 2018

Juliani Meeting Room
Town Hall

Zoning Board of Appeals Members Present: Richard L. Seegel, Chairman
J. Randolph Becker
David G. Sheffield, Acting Chairman
Robert W. Levy
Derek B. Redgate

ZBA 2018-05, TIMOTHY HO & KRISTIN JACQUES, 42 RIVER RIDGE

Presenting the case at the hearing were Jacob Lilley, Architect, Timothy Ho and Kristin Jacques, the Petitioner.

Mr. Seegel said that the Board received revised plans but they do not address one of the problems that the Board had. He read a letter from the Town Engineer that stated that the current driveway layout does not conform to the Town's standards for semi-circular driveway aprons, due to the less than the required 20 feet minimum between driveway openings and the majority of the driveway being on Town property. He said that the Town Engineer was concerned about parking on Town property that could lead to issues during road maintenance such as plowing. He said that the DPW suggested that the current parking layout conform to the Town standard and be able to accommodate a potential increase in the number of cars being parked on the property. Mr. Sheffield submitted a potential solution to the parking issue to the Board. Mr. Seegel discussed taking the semi-circular driveway out. Mr. Lilley said that he went to the Department of Public Works (DPW) Engineering Division and discussed the project. He asked if they should rework the plan to pull the driveway onto the property. He said that they told him that the street has an edge that extends out way beyond the property line. He said that they would like to see a parking space that is clearly on the property and to show erosion controls around the proposed work. He said that he asked specifically if the Town would like to have the driveway reworked. He said that he was told that as long as they can park off of the town right of way, the Town would not have an issue with the layout. Mr. Sheffield said that means that only one car can park off of the Town right of way. He said that what Mr. Lilley was saying was contrary to what the Engineering Division had previously stated in their recommendation. Mr. Lilley said that letter was written before the first meeting. Mr. Sheffield said that the Board would like to see another letter from DPW. Mr. Seegel said that the letter must reference the 2/13/18 revised plan and say that it is acceptable to DPW. He discussed continuing the hearing versus voting approval subject to getting the letter from DPW. Mr. Lilley said that the homeowners would like to change the plan to what Mr.

Sheffield had proposed. Mr. Sheffield said that if the plan is revised in accordance with his suggestions, the letter from DPW will not be necessary. He said that his plan will enable them to keep the existing walk. He submitted his proposed plan to the Petitioner.

Mr. Becker asked if the proposed drywell is only for the addition or for the totality of the property. Mr. Lilley said that he asked the Town Engineer if they would have to have a soil survey done. He said that he was told that it was not necessary. He said that they were asked to show a drywell for the addition. He said that he asked if they needed to show one for the rest of the property and was told that the issue has to do with the new addition. He said that they placed the drywell at the back near the downspouts. Mr. Seegel asked about the capacity of the drywell. Mr. Becker asked what the basis for the size of the drywell was. Mr. Lilley said that he asked the town if they needed to do geo-technical engineering to size the drywell. He said that he was told that it was not required and that they just would like to see remediation for the water. Mr. Becker discussed consistency of the plan before the Board that it may approve and the feasibility of that. He said that somebody had to say to the Engineer to put the drywell on the plan at a certain size. Mr. Lilley said that there is a note on the survey that states that the drywell design will be finalized at a later date. He said that it is a placeholder. He said that the size and depth will be an engineering effort. Mr. Sheffield questioned if that gets to be a design in process where they excavate and the engineer comes out to look at it. He discussed inserting a condition of approval that there be certification of the drywell being the correct capacity.

Mr. Seegel discussed inserting two conditions, one is submittal of a revised plan that eliminates the encroachment on town land and a certification from an engineer that the drywell is sized properly.

Brian Levey, Esq. asked if he would be allowed to address the Board regarding opposition to the petition. Mr. Seegel said that Mr. Levey can ask questions about the drainage issue. He said that the Board previously discussed the project at the February 1, 2018 public hearing. Mr. Levey said that he was representing the abutter at 46 River Ridge. He asked to address the DPW comments in their letter to Board that was submitted in January. Mr. Seegel said that DPW has been seen since those comments were submitted. He said that the pre-imposed drainage calculations are no longer requested. Mr. Seegel said that there is a note on the new plan that the drywell design will be finalized at a later date. Mr. Levey said that he saw that and wondered if that would be sufficient for the Board. Mr. Seegel said that the Board will condition the approval on getting the engineer's certificate. Mr. Levey said that there had been discussion about the drainage system being shown. He said that there is nothing except for the box that Mr. Becker pointed out. He questioned whether they will be able to size the drywell to fit in the area when they go to do the work. He questioned getting the information after the fact rather than beforehand. He said that it leaves his clients at a bit of a disadvantage. He requested that the erosion controls that are shown on the plan be continued down further to the street along the common boundary because a walkway is proposed along the side that was not in the prior plan. He said that the proposed erosion control would be safer if it continued along the entire common boundary rather than stopping. He said that they do not have any dimensions for the parking and they are looking to have them put on the plan so that they can see that there are two spaces. Mr. Seegel said that the Board will need to see a revised plan that shows the change, a letter from DPW, and the size of the parking spaces. He said that he did not have a problem with continuing the erosion control along the entire side.

Mr. Levey said that in the DPW memo, it was discussed that construction parking will be an issue. He asked about requiring some sort of a construction management document to show where they will park the cars. Mr. Seegel said that the Board does not do that for single family residences.

Mr. Sheffield confirmed with Mr. Levey that the erosion control is to address a raise in the topography that would allow some water to run through to the property at 46 River Ridge under the fence. He

questioned if Mr. Levey was asking for a swale to prevent that runoff. Mr. Levey said that they will need an engineer to provide a plan with a recommendation. He said that if DPW is reviewing it, that would be satisfactory. Mr. Lilley said that they following the DPW recommendation for location of the erosion control.

Mr. Seegel discussed getting a letter from DPW. Mr. Sheffield said that the letter will not be required if the plan is changed. Mr. Seegel said that the Board needs to see the letter. He discussed continuing the hearing until April.

Mr. Sheffield said that the conditions will require a revised plan showing the parking areas being properly sized, with dimensions. He said that the drainage will be as approved by an engineer, upon observing the work in process, and the erosion control. Mr. Sheffield moved and Mr. Becker seconded the motion to grant a special permit, subject to the conditions that the Applicant shall submit a further revised plan showing the erosion control going all the way down to the street, elimination of any encroachment River Ridge, show two parking spaces on the property, sized by an engineer, and the drainage will be determined by a civil engineer and certified to the ZBA. Mr. Seegel said that approval is subject to those conditions and receipt of the plan. He said that the Board would like to have the plan within seven days. The Board voted unanimously to grant a special permit.

Myriam Spiegel submitted materials to the Executive Secretary.

ZBA 2017-68, 16 MICA RE LLC, 16 MICA LANE

Presenting the request at the public meeting was David Himmelberger, Esq., representing 16 Mica RE LLC as well as Edgewater Properties LLC, Mitchell Kassler, Manager. He said that Edgewater Properties LLC has entered into an agreement to purchase 16 Mica Lane from the current owner. He said that also present at the public meeting are Dan Malloy, Civil Engineer and Thomas Jonak, Architect. He said that this previously came before the Board for Site Plan Approval in September of 2017. He said that after Site Plan Approval was granted, the prospective new owner determined that some minor changes would be appropriate. He said that he outlined those changes in a letter to the Board. He said that architectural changes are not typically the focus of Site Plan Approval but are a change from the plans that were approved by the Board. He said that the architectural changes involve minor changes to the materials and exterior building elements, in addition to changes at the rear of the structure. He said that the changes are shown on the plan with a bubble around them.

Mr. Himmelberger said that landscaping changes involve substitution of recycled plastic wheel stops for concrete wheel stops, to permit them to be removed temporarily for snow removal. He said that they removed the string lights and substituted bollard lights, substituted 12 foot metal light poles for the 10 foot wood pole lights, changes directly in front of the building to add greenspace that involve a change from the chain link screen to a seat wall and trees at the dumpster, a change from wood posts to masonry pier signs, and the asphalt alley changed to crushed stone.

Mr. Himmelberger said that the free standing wooden totems that were purely decorative and concrete pavers that went through the middle of the bioswale will be omitted.

Mr. Himmelberger said that they will add three additional trees to the landscape and planting beds in front of the building. He said that the narrow bioswale will be reduced in width to allow for expanded parking lanes and the ability of vehicles to maneuver more easily to and from parking spaces.

Mr. Himmelberger said that they believe that all of the proposed changes are quite minor and request a determination by the Board that they are minor modifications.

Mr. Sheffield confirmed that most of the architectural changes are changes in material. He said that the other site changes throughout the parking lot are primarily cosmetic changes. Mr. Himmelberger said that some additional greenspace will be directly in front of the building.

Mr. Sheffield said that he views changes that come before the Board in terms of whether the Board have approved it in the first instance. Mr. Levy said that minor modifications are technically supposed to correct typographical errors or minor insignificant matters. He said that the purpose of a public hearing is to allow members of the public to comment. He said that the Board frequently finds that minor changes that bear no great significance on the jurisdiction of this Board or its approval, is generally found to be a minor modification.

Mr. Himmelberger said that central focus of SPA in this instance concerned the parking field. He said that they have retained the 25 parking spaces and there has been no changes in the traffic or density. He said that it is just a case of removing some triangular areas at the heads of parking spaces and putting in greenspace. He said that, in this particular case, the changes are sufficiently minor that the Board could grant approval.

Mr. Redgate confirmed that none of the changes are to the square footage of the building. He said that one of the Board's issues at the time of approval was entrance and exit onto Washington Street and the general circulation of the site, which seems to have stayed the same or maybe been improved. Mr. Himmelberger said that it has been improved because the lane through is wider now.

Mr. Levy asked how the removable wheel stops will be secured. Mr. Himmelberger said that they have spikes that go through. He said that they are more easily removable than the spikes in concrete wheel stops. Mr. Levy confirmed that the plastic wheel stops will be moved during a storm event. Mr. Himmelberger said that they will move them, plow and then put them back. He said that the 25 pound weight of the plastic wheel stops makes it possible to do that. Mr. Levy confirmed that a car bumping up against the plastic wheel stops will not displace them.

Mr. Levy moved and Mr. Redgate seconded the motion to find that the requested changes are a minor modification. The Board voted unanimously to find that the requested changes are a minor modification.

ZBA 2017-89, UNITED INVESTMENT FLEET LLC, 48 CEDAR STREET

Presenting the request at the public meeting were Tom Zou, representing United Investment Fleet LLC and Terry Morris, Esq. Mr. Morris said that this request is in connection with a decision made by the Board on December 7, 2017 that granted permission to build a two story addition with an attached two car garage and a one story entry porch. He said that subsequent to that decision, his client was informed that he needed to go to the Historic Commission because this was a partial demolition to remove portions of the roof. He said that after meeting with the Historic Commission, his client made revisions to the roof plans. He said that Sheet A7 in the materials that were submitted illustrates the changes. He said that Sheet A7 shows a profile of the house that has an outline of the original roofline shown as dashed lines. He said that it consists of three elements, the original pitched roof, a shed dormer that was attached at one time, and another doghouse dormer that was attached at some time. He said that it was a rather convoluted set up. He said that it is outlined on the cover page that was submitted. He said that you can see how the elements intersected one another. He said that the roof features were deemed to be not original. He said that the Historic Commission wanted his client to restore the original ridge height of the building. He said that you can see the pitch of the ridgeline

restored on Sheet A7. He said that the net result was that it increased the floor area in the attic by 221 square feet. He said that computation is shown on the cover sheet – T3 – roof plan –

Mr. Levy asked how the proposed changes differ from the approved plan. Mr. Morris said that the plan is to re-establish the ridge height of the original house without the doghouse dormers. Mr. Sheffield said that the plan is to raise the ridge height from what was approved on the original plans. Mr. Morris said that they want the primary entry of the house to not be dominated by the addition. He said that they will raise the ridge height so that it is higher than the ridge on the addition. He said that established a proper relationship between the two elements of the building.

Mr. Sheffield asked if there are skylights included in the plan. Mr. Zou said that there will be no skylights.

Mr. Morris said that the Board would essentially be changing the control plans, Sheet A7, Street Side Elevation – Southwest, Sheet A8, Garage Side Elevation – Southeast, Sheet A9, Northeast Elevation, and Sheet A10, Left Side Elevation – Northwest.

Mr. Levy said that it looks like the size of the attic will be doubled. He said that the requirement to go through Historic Commission review is new. He said that this is a change to the house that is visible to the public. He said that the question is whether the public should have an opportunity to review the changes and respond, since the finding was made that it was not substantially more detrimental. Mr. Sheffield said that it is basically going back to what it was.

Mr. Morris said that the approval was a Section 6 finding. Mr. Levy said that the finding of substantial detriment has already been made. He said that the question is whether this rises to the level of where the public should be invited to participate in that determination. He said that a minor modification is not a public hearing, it is a public meeting. He said that this was not noticed and abutters were not provided with notice. Mr. Morris said that the record shows that they had two hearings, the original and the continued hearings, and no one appeared at either of the hearings. He said that they were properly and duly noticed.

Mr. Sheffield asked if there is a dimension showing the height from average grade for the new ridge line. Mr. Morris said that Sheet A8 shows a dimension of 25 feet 8 inches from the first floor. He said that it does not show it because the house will be restored to what it was originally. Mr. Sheffield said that dimension is usually given to the average grade around the house. Mr. Morris said that there is reference to that in the original decision. He said that he had responded to a Board member's question, stating that the height was 27.9 feet. He said that the Architect, Mr. Lewis, stated said that Sheet A8 shows a height of 25.8 feet from the first floor to the highest ridge, that from the grade to the first floor is a couple more feet, and that all of the structure will be under 30 feet. He said that the original ridge height is 30.8 feet. He said that the ridge of the addition will be 27.9 feet. He said that the driving force behind the Historic Commission wanting the change was to re-establish a proper relationship between the two elements of the building.

Mr. Levy asked if the Applicant had a copy of the original submittal package. Mr. Sheffield said that he was a spectator at the second hearing. Mr. Redgate said that he was a member of the original panel but was replaced by another member when he was unable to attend the continued hearing.

Mr. Redgate said that the fact that the Applicant is back before the Board because of suggestions from the Historic Commission, and they are trying to comply with that recommendation, and the fact that the additional square footage will be in the attic and will not add to the footprint of the building, he did not think that the Applicant should have to come back for a public hearing.

Mr. Levy said that the issue is whether the change is significant enough to warrant public input. He said that the changes will be less than the existing condition. Mr. Morris said that the existing roof is rather complex. He said that it has been simplified. Mr. Levy said that he could probably support the request but thinks that it is at the edge of what he would consider to be a minor modification.

Mr. Redgate moved and Mr. Levy seconded the motion that the Board find that the change to the plans due to the Historic Commission's comments are minor in nature and does not require re-opening of a public hearing. The Board voted unanimously to find that the change to the plans due to the Historic Commission's comments are minor in nature and does not require re-opening of a public hearing.

ZBA 2018-09, DNH HOMES, LLC, 7 WILDON ROAD

Presenting the case at the hearing was Stan Hargas, who said that he is the owner of 7 Wildon Road and is a builder. He said that also present at the hearing was Mike Hunter, who is part of the design team.

Mr. Hargas said that they were one of the first projects to go through the Historic Commission to get approval for demolition of a historically, originally significant house. He said that they went through four hearings and designed the house together with the Historic Commission and the design team. He said that in the past he has tried to keep an original house and add an addition. He said that this property is a cape and there was nothing that he could do in terms of adding on and make it marketable. He said that he requested permission to demolish the property.

Mr. Hargas said that the petition is before the Board because the lot is 11, 222 square feet in a 20,000 square foot Single Residence District. He said that the proposal is to build a house that is appropriate for a 10,000 square foot lot. He said that the total TLAG is about 3,600 square feet plus an attic space. He said that because of the new bylaw, which took effect July 1, 2017, they had to include the attic and the garage. He said that brings the TLAG to 4,400 square feet. He said that the request is for a special permit because of the nonconforming lot.

Mr. Redgate asked if the original plan was to do an addition or to demolish the house. Mr. Hargas said that the plan has always been to raze the house. He said that, as part of the Historic Commission hearings, they had a neighbor to the right of the property who was quite involved in the final design. He said that they have had significant neighborhood input. He said that they believe that what they have designed is consistent with the neighborhood. He said that it will not be a mc mansion.

Mr. Levy asked if most of the lots in the neighborhood are undersized. Mr. Hargas said that they are. He said that they submitted photographs of the houses in the neighborhood and they are pretty consistent. Mr. Redgate said that the house next door appears to be even smaller. Mr. Sheffield said that # 6 across the street appears to be a similar size on a much smaller lot. Mr. Hargas said that there was a house built about five or six years ago that did not have to conform to the new requirements. He said that it is a fairly large colonial. He said that they tried to stay away from that.

Mr. Sheffield said that this is a neighborhood of modest sized homes, so far. –

Mr. Levy asked about Total Living Area plus Garage (TLAG) calculations. Mr. Hargas shared his TLAG calculations with the Board. Mr. Levy said that the TLAG will be 4,418 square feet, including the attic and the garage.

Mr. Sheffield asked if there was anyone present at the public hearing who wished to speak to the petition.

Mr. Sheffield read the Planning Board recommendation.

Mr. Levy moved and Mr. Redgate seconded the motion that the Board make a finding that the new structure shall not be substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood than the existing nonconformities and approve a special permit. The Board voted unanimously to grant a special permit.

ZBA 2018-10 REBECCA & JOSEPH KANNAM, 20 DAMIEN ROAD

Presenting the case at the hearing were Richard Leaf, Architect, and Rebecca and Joseph Kannam, the Petitioner. Mr. Leaf said that the Kannams have lived at 20 Damien Road since 1996 and raised three kids there. He said that the proposal is for a 630 square foot one story addition to the back of the house for a two car garage and outdoor storage space. He said that the house was built in 1925. He said that the lot is a little over 15,000 square feet.

Mr. Leaf displayed a GIS map of the neighborhood. He said that directly across the street is the 15,000 square foot Single Residence District. He said that 20 Damien Road is located in a 10,000 square foot Single Residence District.

Mr. Leaf said that the petition is before the Board because the addition will be more than 600 square feet and they are adding to a pre-existing nonconforming structure with less than required front setbacks. He said that the addition will be conforming. He said that his understanding is that the petition is subject to Bjorklund vs Norwell State case law. He said that the addition will be over 600 square feet.

Mr. Leaf said that the proposal is for a two car garage and a storage piece. He said that there is an existing shed that an existing shed on the property will be demolished. He said that even though it there is a 20 foot side yard setback requirement, they have a 30 foot side yard setback because it is a side facing garage. He said that it will be a conforming addition.

Mr. Sheffield said that he liked the storage unit being a little bit smaller than the length of the garage because it makes that side appear smaller to the neighbor. He said that it has a scaling element to it.

Mr. Redgate asked about the dashed line on the plot plan. He asked if the Kannams own two properties. Mr. Sheffield said that the dashed line goes through the existing shed. Mr. Redgate said that there are two lots, one is 13,358 square feet and the other is 2,418 square feet. Mr. Sheffield said that the 15,776 square feet on the plot plan is for Parcels 1 and 2. Mr. Levy said that they are under common ownership and would be merged for Zoning purposes. Mr. Redgate asked if the parcels would need to be combined. Mr. Sheffield said that the Town document shows it combined already.

Mr. Leaf said that the homeowners came before the Board last summer with a different designer to request a variance. He said that the request was to place the garage approximately eight feet from the side property line. He said that they made a concerted effort to come up with a design that works with the architecture of the house and works with all of the Zoning constraints.

Mr. Sheffield asked if there was anyone present at the public hearing who wished to speak to the petition.

Mr. Sheffield read the Planning Board recommendation.

Mr. Levy moved and Mr. Redgate seconded the motion that the Board make a finding that the proposed structure shall not be substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood and approve a special permit. The Board voted unanimously to grant a special permit.

ZBA 2018-11, KRISTINE & FRANK NORMANDIN, 9 OXFORD ROAD

Presenting the case at the hearing were Leslie Mahoney, Architect, and Kristine and Frank Normandin, the Petitioner. Ms. Mahoney said that it is an existing nonconforming home due to the setbacks on the right side. She said that the proposal is to add a second story over the garage, continuing the nonconforming setback. She said that it is required to be 20 feet and it is currently at 19.2 feet. Mr. Levy said that the house is located in a 10,000 square foot Single Residence District.

Mr. Redgate asked if the footprint will be enlarged at all. Ms. Mahoney said that they will extend back 9.3 feet. She said that they will also expand across the back of the house. Mr. Sheffield said that the location of the bulkhead will change. Mr. Levy confirmed that they will hold the setback at 19.2 feet.

Mr. Sheffield said that he is familiar with this neighborhood. He said that there are many homes with similar additions throughout the area.

Ms. Mahoney said that the neighbors' houses are not significantly close.

Mr. Levy said that the Planning Board commented that the application is subject to review by the Historic Commission.

Mr. Sheffield asked if there was anyone present at the public hearing who wished to speak to the petition.

Mr. Redgate moved and Mr. Levy seconded the motion that the Board make a finding that the existing nonconformities are not intensified and the proposed structure shall not be substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood than the existing nonconforming structure and approve a special permit. The Board voted unanimously to grant a special permit.

ZBA 2018-12, ANDREW & VIRGINIA SNOW, 40 EMERSON ROAD

Presenting the case at the hearing were Virginia and Andrew Snow, the Petitioner. Ms. Snow said that the request is for a special permit to build a 500 square foot two story addition at the back of their house. She said that the lot is nonconforming at 14,250 square feet in a 15,000 square foot Single Residence District. She said that the house is conforming to setbacks, lot coverage and height. She said that the proposed addition will conform in all of those respects.

Mr. Redgate asked if the homeowners had done the TLAG calculations themselves. Mr. Snow said that he had some help.

Mr. Sheffield asked if there was anyone present at the public hearing who wished to speak to the petition.

Mr. Sheffield read the Planning Board recommendation.

Mr. Redgate moved and Mr. Levy seconded the motion that the Board make a finding that the proposed structure shall not be substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood than the existing

nonconforming structure and approve a special permit. The Board voted unanimously to grant a special permit.

ZBA 2018-13 BABSON COLLEGE, 11 BABSON COLLEGE DRIVE – HORN LIBRARY

Presenting the case at the hearing were David Grissino, Director, Capital Projects and Planning and Stephen Langer, Esq. Mr. Grissino said that the project involves an addition to the Horn Library. He said that also present at the hearing were members of the design team including Finegold Alexander Architects, Stephen Stimson Associates, Landscape Architects, H.W. Moore, Engineers, and Lee Kennedy Co., builders.

Mr. Grissino said that Babson is no different from many libraries across the country in that they are dealing with changes in the way that people are using libraries. He said that people are looking for different kinds of spaces in the library such as places to work together collaboratively, group study spaces and things that are very different from when the library was initially designed and built. He said that the first floor of the existing library is as loud and energetic as the Campus Center. He said that there are a lot of students working in groups. He said that the upper levels of the library are where quiet spaces are and there are precious few of those spaces. He said that the impetus for this project for a 9,900 square foot addition at the front of the building is to provide dedicated designed space for the new kinds of interactions that are happening in the library. He said that they want to put the collaborative way that students are learning today and put it out on display along College Drive. He said that it will give them ability in the future to rethink and repurpose some of those interior spaces.

Mr. Grissino said that the program for the building includes a couple of new classrooms, one on each level that are state of the art technologically. He said that the heart of the project is the lounge spaces, the café with seating and an interior environment that is welcoming and a place where people will want to gather. He said that the exterior design is meant to relate to Babson's architectural guidelines, similar to the Athletic Center that came before the Board recently. He said that it relies heavily on Georgian architecture. He said that they are trying to provide more unity across the college by having a more traditional brick expression along the library but also have portions of the addition that relate to non-traditional and modern existing buildings. He said that they are trying to do a little bit of both with the new design.

Mr. Grissino said that the site around the library has several spaces around it that were never well designed, with the exception of the area where they are building. He said that they want to enhance the landscape around the rest of the project. He said that they will open up a door that is not currently used and is not accessible. He said that accessibility is very important as part of the overall project. He said that currently as you approach the library from College Drive, there are many grade changes, a series of stairs and a plaza until you get to the main level of the library. He said that the addition will bring the entry down to the sidewalk level, where you enter straight in and access a new elevator.

Mr. Grissino said that the existing building has few restrooms, so a couple will be added as part of the new addition. He said that there is very little demand on the water and sewer systems as part of the project. –

Mr. Grissino said that they will collect, divert and clean stormwater, which is an improvement over the existing site condition. He said that there will be less impervious area on the site after it is developed that is currently there today.

Mr. Grissino said that Babson currently has several ongoing projects. He said that construction management is very important to them. He said that Babson has been very mindful for all of their

contractors to follow the established routes that were outlined in the previous Site Plan Approvals. He said that they will have regular meetings with all of the contractors to collectively review and manage the different impacts of all of the construction happening concurrently.

Mr. Grissino said that the construction manager for this site has provided a detailed Construction Management Plan (CMP), including providing safe alternative routes around the building. He said that they will partially close the sidewalk in front of the building to direct people in a safe manner around the site. He said that the heaviest activity on the Webster Site and the Weissman Site involving foundations and steel will both be completed by the time this construction would ideally start.

Mr. Grissino said that they met with the Design Review Board (DRB) on several occasions to discuss landscape and building design. He said that they met extensively with the Department of Public Works (DPW). He said that George Saraceno, Town Engineering Division, sent a final letter today stated that all issues had been resolved with DPW. He said that Babson hosted a neighborhood meeting where they relayed all of the details of the project and they received enthusiastic support for the project. He said that the Library, like the Athletic Center, is one of the places that has a lot of community interface and users outside the Babson Community who come to the campus.

Mr. Sheffield commented on the amount of utility work that has to be done to avoid the construction and the sequence of events that has to happen. He asked about handicapped access through the library. Mr. Grissino said that there will be four different accessible routes into the complex. He said that the Horn Library is five separate structures and this will be the sixth. He said that the primary accessible entrance will be from College Drive from the sidewalk, directly into the building. He said that there will be an elevator on the ground floor, located inside the new addition, that will take you up one level to main level of Library where it connects to all of the buildings. He said that you can also enter at the existing accessible entrance at the Horn Computer Center and at the Kriebel Building at the left. He said that they will be constructing a new entrance behind Gerber Hall into the Horn Library. He said that the original design of the building had a door that led out to a raised patio. He said that at some point in the past some stairs were added to that. He said that the door is not currently used. He said that they will open up that door and add an accessible ramp so that it is a place that students can freely go in and out.

Mr. Sheffield asked if the doors that adjacent to the elevator will be electronically assisted. He asked if there will be a paddle for the main door. Mr. Grissino displayed the accessible route on a plan. He said that there will be accessible entrances at the main entry and one on the left side. He said that a button will open the door.

Mr. Sheffield asked if all three bathrooms will be accessible. Mr. Grissino said that the bathrooms will be unisex and accessible.

Mr. Grissino said that an important part of the experience is a lot of glass in the building and a skylight that are intended to allow for four trees and a sunken garden area with seasonal plantings that will relate to plantings on the exterior of the building. He said that Babson wants to have a place that is welcoming year round.

Mr. Redgate confirmed that the Fire Department submitted a letter to the Board.

Mr. Levy asked if there will be any new exterior lighting. Mr. Grissino said that Babson is currently investigating having standard poles throughout the site and a series of downlights on the exterior at the top to wash down the exterior brick. Mr. Levy said that the addition will have a lot of glass. He asked about light spillover. Mr. Grissino said that they are hoping that will be the case. He said that the idea

is that this is in the heart of the campus. He said that the design is a three sided volume that they hope will become a beacon for people to gravitate to at night. He said that they do not anticipate any external impact. He said that it will not be visible off campus. He said that they hope that it will be welcoming for students coming from the major quad directly across the street which is the freshmen and sophomore area and also for people who are coming from the Olin School and the Graduate School areas, and the Athletic Center. Mr. Levy asked if the lights will be turned off at a certain time. Mr. Grissino said that the Library is open until 2 am. He said that safety lighting will be coordinated with Babson's Public Safety Office.

Mr. Sheffield said that he had put together a set of draft conditions and passed them along to Mr. Grissino for comment. He distributed copies for the Board. -

Mr. Levy asked about the frack tank. Paul Leonard, representing Lee Kennedy Co. Inc, Construction Manager, said that they are thinking that there is water within the ground that they think they might encounter. He said that they are still working that through with the design team. He said that it is a precautionary measure in case they do hit groundwater. He said that they will pump and purify the water so that sediments do not get dumped into the ground. He said that it is a stormwater retention system where they pump the water in, make sure it is clarified and the water seeps out. He said that water was encountered at a couple of test pits after heavy rains. Mr. Grissino said that what Babson has found from geo-technical studies is that there is a tremendous amount of glacial till on campus and water is perched because it cannot infiltrate. Mr. Levy confirmed that this process will occur only during construction. Mr. Leonard said that the hope is that they will not need it.

Mr. Sheffield said that the project is located in a Water Supply Protection District (WSPD). Mr. Levy said that there are no hazardous materials that the Board should be concerned with.

Mr. Levy confirmed that the comments from the Department of Public Works (DPW) have been satisfied. Mr. Grissino said that George Saraceno sent a final letter today.

Mr. Sheffield said that Lee Kennedy Construction should work with the Police on construction traffic routes.

Mr. Sheffield questioned why the addition extend out to a gallery of arches that make the entrance more grand rather than having an attached foyer. Mr. Grissino said that the entire first volume that is the 60 by 60 foot cube is meant to feel like you are still outside. He said that the space will be a transition between that and the much quieter library go into the building proper. Mr. Sheffield said that he thinks that the kids will really like this. Mr. Grissino said that they felt that the building size will fit comfortably within the space. He said that this is small addition but it will have a tremendous visual impact on College Drive.

Mr. Levy asked when they anticipate construction and how long will it last. Mr. Grissino said that they would like to start right after graduation and have it open by commencement in 2019 for the centennial celebration.

Mr. Redgate asked about progress on the athletic facility. Mr. Grissino said that the foundations are progressing and they are about to finish. He said that steel will start to arrive for the Athletic Center and the Weissman Center. He said that they expect to have the steel frames for both of those buildings done by May and will then proceed with the building envelopes. He said that they will hold their first competition at the new tennis courts this month. He said that construction went well and the courts are now open for use.

Mr. Sheffield asked if there was anyone present at the public hearing who wished to speak to the petition.

Mr. Sheffield read the Planning Board recommendation.

The Board discussed Mr. Sheffield's draft conditions and Mr. Grissino's response. The Board said that draft condition #14 would be revised to state that the operation and maintenance of the stormwater runoff and drainage system shall comply with the requirements of the Town's Municipal Stormwater Drainage System Rules and Regulations, as are currently in effect.

Mr. Grissino asked that draft condition #17 be taken out because the project did not go through the PSI process.

Mr. Grissino commented on draft condition #4. He said that Babson has a Capital Projects website on Babson's website that includes all of the active projects and contact information. The Board said that the language can be revised to say that the Applicant shall maintain a website rather than establish.

Mr. Levy moved and Mr. Redgate seconded the motion to approve Site Plan Approval, subject to the conditions as modified on March 1, 2018. The Board voted unanimously to grant Site Plan Approval.

Mr. Levy moved and Mr. Redgate seconded the motion to grant a special permit for a major construction project in a Water Supply Protection District. The Board voted unanimously to grant a special permit.

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the hearing was adjourned at 9:16 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Lenore R. Mahoney
Executive Secretary