



ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

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

RICHARD L. SEEGEL, 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

Thursday, December 7, 2017, 7:30 pm

Juliani Meeting Room
Town Hall

Zoning Board of Appeals Members Present: Richard L. Seegel, Chairman
J. Randolph Becker
David G. Sheffield
Walter B. Adams

PUBLIC HEARINGZBA 2017-66, ROBERT SARAFIAN, 6 CLIFFORD STREET

The Chairman said that the Board received a written request that the petition be allowed to be withdrawn without prejudice. Mr. Becker moved and Mr. Sheffield seconded the motion to allow the petition to be withdrawn without prejudice. The Board voted unanimously to allow the petition to be withdrawn without prejudice.

ZBA 2017-96, GERALDINE JARVIS, 26 HARRIS AVENUE

Presenting the case at the hearing were David Himmelberger, Esq. and Geraldine Jarvis, the Petitioner.

Mr. Himmelberger said that this was previously before the Board for renewal for a license for dog daycare with an additional component for overnight boarding of up to 10 client dogs. He said that because that was a new component piece of the request for a special permit and had not been notice within the publication in the newspaper for the first hearing, the Board thought that it made sense to have it published as a separate notice.

Mr. Himmelberger said that the Applicant has been operating this home occupation since 2004. He said that the Board has previously submitted letters of support from neighbors, direct abutters and the Animal Control Officer, Sue Webb. He said that the request is to renew the special permit for a home occupation for dog daycare with the further proviso that no more than 10 client dogs be allowed to stay overnight, and that the special permit be issued for a three year period.

Mr. Sheffield said that the Board approved a special permit for extension of the day care and since it had no experience with overnight boarding of dogs, it asked the Animal Control Officer's opinion. He said that the Town is working on a kennel license that will have to be purchased and the Animal Control

Office will do inspections at some frequency to see that the State and local regulations are carried out. He said that the dogs need to be crated when they are not supervised and there is a minimum crate sizing related to breeds of dogs. Mr. Himmelberger said that they Applicant would accept that as a condition.

Mr. Seegel asked how many dogs are expected to stay overnight. Ms. Jarvis said that she expects there to be seven to ten dogs. Mr. Becker asked how many dogs Ms. Jarvis anticipated having on an average night. Ms. Jarvis said that she expects to have three to four dogs on an average night.

Mr. Seegel said that Ms. Jarvis has had her dog daycare there for a long time and there have been no complaints. He said that this will be a new step up.

Mr. Sheffield asked Ms. Jarvis if she has already determined the size and types of kennels she will need. Ms. Jarvis said that she has pet owner insurance for her daycare business and she has to provide the Insurance Company with that information. Mr. Sheffield asked about the location of the kennels. Ms. Jarvis said that the kennels will be in the basement that has four foot windows. She said that she will have also have a couple in the kitchen. She said that the house has a ventilation system.

Mr. Sheffield said that since this is a new step up, the Board should think about scheduling appropriate inspections over a period of time after the activity has commenced. Mr. Seegel said that it would be appropriate to have Sue Webb do inspections every six months for the first permit so that the Board knows that everything is going smoothly.

Mr. Himmelberger said that the request is to grant the special permit for three years. Mr. Seegel said that Condition #4 of the previously granted permit states that there shall be no overnight boarding of any nonresident dogs. He asked if Ms. Jarvis has dogs from outside of Wellesley. Ms. Jarvis said that she has some dogs from Waban.

Mr. Seegel said that the Board should amend the existing special permit rather than issue a separate special permit. He said that the Board will modify Conditions 2, 4 and 6. He said that the expiration will be changed to three years.

Mr. Sheffield asked about the definition of a nonresident dog. He confirmed that the dogs that will stay overnight are dogs that are there during the day. Mr. Himmelberger said that as originally set forth, nonresident dogs meant dogs not owned by Ms. Jarvis. Mr. Seegel said that Condition 4 will be eliminated and Condition 2 will be modified to 24 hours a day. Mr. Becker asked what happens after 7 pm. He asked if Ms. Jarvis will be the only one there to look after three to four dogs. Ms. Jarvis said that she has a CNA and a nurse for her mother who help out with dog care. She said that the nurse will leave between 8 and 9 pm. Mr. Himmelberger said that Ms. Jarvis is the primary dog care provider.

Mr. Himmelberger discussed eliminating Condition #2. Mr. Seegel said that he did not have a problem with that. He said that it is essentially becoming a 24 hour operation.

Mr. Adams asked if the current daytime limit is 10 dogs. Mr. Himmelberger said that the daytime limit is 15 dogs. He said that Condition # 1 could be change to no more than 15 dogs on the premises between 7 am to 7 pm and no more than 10 dogs between 7 pm and 7 am. He said that Condition 2 can be deleted. Mr. Seegel said that Conditions 1 and 2 will be combined, Condition 2 and Condition 4 will be deleted and Condition 6 will be modified.

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

Mr. Becker moved and Mr. Sheffield seconded the motion to grant an amendment to a special permit, subject to the combination Conditions 1 and 2 from the prior approval to state that there shall be no more than 15 dogs on the premises between 7 am to 7 pm and no more than 10 dogs between 7 pm and 7 am, that the permit shall be in effect for three years instead of two years, and that there shall be inspections made by the Animal Control Officer every six months for a three year period. The Board voted unanimously to amend the special permit.

ZBA 2017-59, DANA & ELLEN CONTI, 157 WESTON ROAD

Presenting the case were David Himmelberger, Esq. and Dana Conti, the Petitioner. Mr. Himmelberger said that this is a request for a determination of minor modification for a previously issued special permit to allow for construction of a rear addition to the home at 157 Weston Road. He said that construction has commenced. He said that the original special permit called for a two-story addition at the rear of the premises with a one-story porch. He said that as they are in the process of building it, a decision was made that it made more sense to extend the second floor out over the existing first floor porch. He said that although there will be no greater depth of the building as previously permitted, it will now be a full two and a half stories that was previously permitted up to the porch. He said that it is an exceptionally deep lot. He said that all of the impacted neighbors submitted letters of support, of which five are abutters. He said that because the property is in the midst of construction, the hope is that the Board would agree that this can be characterized as a minor modification to permit the construction to continue and to come out over what had been the first floor porch area at the full height. He said that the Total Living Area plus Garage (TLAG) will increase modestly – photos show it well –

Mr. Sheffield said that on new elevation, Plan A5, it shows the second floor extended over the porch area. He asked if the porch area will remain open. Mr. Conti said that there will be no change to the first floor. He said that it will remain open. Mr. Himmelberger said that the request is to add above that.

Mr. Sheffield asked if the foundation was corrected to accommodate the weight of a second floor. Mr. Conti said that is a hill in the back. He said that when they dug down to pour the foundation for the porch, they found that there is a foundation already there that goes deep and that has since been completed for the porch. Mr. Sheffield asked how far down the foundation goes. Mr. Conti said that he was not sure but he knows that it is a little bit less than the rest of the foundation. He said that it goes down six to eight feet. Mr. Sheffield confirmed that there are foundation drains around it. Mr. Becker said that the original plan does not show the foundation either. Mr. Seegel questioned whether a structural engineer should certify that the foundation can support a second floor. Mr. Himmelberger said that will be a building permit issue.

Mr. Becker asked what changed to cause the decision to expand that space. Mr. Conti said that they wanted to add a tub and it would not fit in the existing bathroom. He said that it was easiest to expand to the back instead of having the flat roof.

Mr. Sheffield said that there is a little stone wing wall that extends into the outer edge of the porch shown on Plan A5. He said that he did not see that on the rear elevation. He asked if it goes across the back of the elevations. Mr. Conti said that the foundation of the porch goes down and goes up about three feet. Mr. Sheffield said that it appears to be two feet of exposed stone wall at the corner of the house. He said that the grade is shown on Plan A4 as if that is a retaining wall. He said that the elevated grade is not shown on Plan A5. He said that on Plan A6 the columns go all the way down to the floor. He said that the drawings are not well coordinated. He said that Plans A4 and A5 shown the columns

resting on a cheek wall. He said that the columns on A6 do not show it that way. He said that the plans will have to be corrected. Mr. Conti said that there is a picture that shows the foundation.

Mr. Becker said that there will be an approximately 10 percent increase in TLAG and while it will be below the trigger limit in the bylaw, what amount of change is a minor modification. Mr. Himmelberger said that 10 percent is minor. He said that it will be a 10 foot further construction on the second floor with roof area above it. Mr. Conti said that the TLAG rules have changed since the project was approved. He said that TLAG now includes garages.

Mr. Sheffield said that the side elevations are somewhat saved because the addition will not be in the same plane as the house. He said that it will not appear to be an enormous long wall.

Mr. Becker said that if the Board was seeing this proposal for the first time, there is nothing that leaps off of the page as objectionable. Mr. Seegel and Mr. Sheffield agreed.

Mr. Himmelberger said that he explained what a minor modification would be to Mr. Conti, who it explained to his neighbors. He said that the neighbors saw what had been approved and what was requested and did not see it as a significant change.

Mr. Sheffield said that because the neighbors are aware of the change, he would consider it to be a minor modification. Mr. Becker said that what makes the determination easier to make is the fact that it is below the trigger value and there is some cushion there. He said that this meets the common definition of minor. Mr. Seegel agreed.

Mr. Becker moved and Mr. Sheffield seconded the motion to make a determination that the proposed change is a minor modification that does not require a public hearing. The Board voted unanimously to make a determination that the proposed change is a minor modification that does not require a public hearing.

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

Mr. Seegel said that the Planning Board modified its recommendation and now recommends that the Board grant approval.

Presenting the case at the hearing were Terrence Morris, Esq., Tom Zhou, Principal, United Investment Fleet, LLC, and Scott Lewis, Home Design.

Mr. Morris said that the request is for a Section 6 Finding under Chapter 40A that the proposed structure shall not be substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood than the existing nonconforming structure. He said that the house is a nonconforming structure by virtue of the fact that the side yard setback is nonconforming at 13 feet and the front setback is nonconforming at 22.5 feet. He said that all other aspects are conforming. He said that the property is located in a 10,000 square foot Single Residence District. He said that the lot size is 15,000 square feet, which is 50 percent more than what is required. He said that the structure will meet the rear yard setbacks. He said that the structure will be well below the maximum lot coverage of 20 percent. He said that the height of the building will be approximately 32 feet.

Mr. Morris said that when they were previously before the Board, they proposed a house of approximately 4,300 square feet. He said that it has been reduced by 20 percent to 3,480 square feet.

He said that the existing house presents itself almost as a three-story, given the dimensions of the dormer. He said that they reduced that and simplified the look of the building. He said that they reduced the overall height by almost four feet.

Mr. Adams said that he is a neighbor on River Ridge, which is at the far end from this property. He said that he can offer an impartial decision on this case. He said that he appreciated the Applicant's hearing and addressing the Board's concerns in a very reasonable way.

Mr. Seegel confirmed that on the plans where it says that the outline of the existing roof structure will be removed and rebuilt it means that the roof will be removed and lowered. Mr. Lewis said that the roof will be rebuilt at a drastically lower pitch that will effectively eliminate usable attic space. He said that there will be no habitable space on the third floor. He said that access to the attic will be by pull down stairs.

Mr. Becker asked if the 32.04 feet height that is listed in the table on the plot is correct. Mr. Morris said that it is lower at 27.9 feet. Mr. Lewis said that Sheet A8 shows a height of 25.8 feet from the first floor to the highest ridge. He said that from the grade to the first floor is a couple more feet. He said that all of it will be under 30 feet.

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

Mr. Adams moved and Mr. Becker seconded the motion to find that the proposed structure shall not be substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood than the existing nonconforming structure and to grant a special permit, in accordance with the plans dated 11/28/17. The Board voted unanimously to grant a special permit.

ZBA 2017-91, GARRICK & KATIE STEWART, 62 KIRKLAND CIRCLE

Presenting the case at the hearing was Alyssa LaMora, Designer, and Garrick and Katie Stewart, the Petitioner. Ms. LaMora said that the homeowners have lived there since 2013. She said that they moved in before they had children. She said that they now have two children and one on the way. She said that they love the neighborhood and their house. She said that they would like to add a little more living space and a bedroom. She said that the property is located on an existing nonconforming lot at the corner of Kirkland Circle and Linden Street. She said that the back of the existing house is nonconforming. She said that the proposal is to add on a second story to the existing garage for a bedroom. She said that they are proposing to keep the existing footprint of the garage at the rear of the home and push it forward to the front of the property where there is more room. She said that they are proposing to take down a three season room on the other side of the property and replace it with a larger dining room with a full foundation below and a master bath above.

Mr. Seegel confirmed that it will be a full foundation under the dining room.

Mr. Seegel asked if any thought have been given to changing the driveway location to Kirkland Circle. He said that the proposed structure seems to be a good solution.

Mr. Sheffield said that the air conditioning condenser is within the side yard setback. Mr. Becker it is an existing unit.

Mr. Sheffield said that the proposed addition is appropriate and is a good solution.

Mr. Seegel read the Planning Board recommendation.

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

Leslie Cormier, 367 Linden Street, said that she lives directly across the street. She said that she teaches architecture. She said that she looked at the work and it looked good. She said that she is concerned about the large flat surface that faces Linden Street. She said that it is out of scale, is flat and almost like a billboard size. She said that it is close to Linden Street and is excessively large, flat and square. She said that it will probably block light and add to ice in the winter. She said that there have been serious car accidents in that area. She said that it will block the view. She said that her main concern is the visuals. She said that the side that faces up Kirkland Circle is nicely done but she did not think the same about the side facing Linden Street. She said that it is particularly important that Linden Street maintain its character as an important place of movement through a very domestic neighborhood. She said that this disrupts that sense of domesticity. She said that they could perhaps fix it by lowering it and turning the gable toward Linden Street. Mr. Seegel confirmed that Ms. Cormier was talking about the side of the house facing Linden Street. Ms. Cormier said that she thinks that it is excessively tall, flat and square. Mr. Seegel said that there are three windows in the garage. Ms. Cormier said that at that height above Linden Street and being very blank, it will change the character of the street and not in a good way. She said that it might look better if it is set back on the second floor. She said that it is really excessively large and flat.

Ms. LaMora said that they originally did have a gable end facing Linden Street but it made the Kirkland side, which is the more prominent corner view, look like an extended cape that is quite long. She said that they went with the gable end on Kirkland Circle so that Linden Street would have the cape view with the dormer. She said that the reason for the height is because the driveway is 2.5 feet lower than the first floor, so they had to make up the difference so that they could connect the second floor without a step down.

Ms. Cormier said that her concern is that they turned a nice façade to Kirkland Circle but Linden Street is her view and the light matters. She said that it is really the processional entrance for the neighborhood and Linden Street is an important, significant street that runs through multiple neighborhoods. She said that it is very important to maintain the look of Linden Street for that reason. She said that the building is simply too high, too flat and like a billboard on Linden Street. She said that it would block views as well. She said that she is concerned because the long term character of the street will suffer with flatness facing the street. She said that it is already a nonconforming structure, so it is an even more serious concern.

David Himmelberger, 387 Linden Street, said that he lives four houses down from this property. He said that he wanted to applaud the Applicants in making the effort to retain the original structure and add on to it rather do what is too frequently done to scrape a house off and start fresh. He said that this house has a lot of character. He said that there are not a lot of houses in Wellesley that have a brick façade fireplace that projects off of the main structure. He said that they are retaining that. He said that counts for a lot. He said that he applauds his neighbors for doing what they are doing by adding on and not knocking down and starting over.

Ms. Cormier said that it matters very much that the street continues its character. She said that there are simple changes that can be made. She said that they can turn the gable and lower the proportions of the house. She said that it has to be done right to maintain the neighborhood.

Mr. Himmelberger asked the Board to consider a condition that there be no construction parking on Linden Street. He said that it is a narrow street and a curve as well, so it would be extremely dangerous.

Mr. Seegel said that taste is different for everybody. He said that he is familiar with the neighborhood. He said that he has driven by there five to ten times a week for over 50 years. He said that he did not see a problem with it himself.

Mr. Sheffield moved and Mr. Becker seconded the motion to approve the petition, as submitted, and subject to a condition that there shall be no construction parking on Linden Street, and make a finding that the proposed structure shall not be substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood than the existing nonconforming structure. The Board voted unanimously to grant a special permit.

ZBA 2017-92, OLIMPIU DEJEU, OLGA BORIC, FREDERICK KLINGMEYER, 28, 30 & 32 RIVER RIDGE

Presenting the case at the hearing were David Himmelberger, Esq. and Olimpiu Dejeu, Petitioner.

Mr. Himmelberger said that the subject properties are located at the corner of River Ridge. He said that all of the existing homes at 28, 30 and 32 River Ridge are nonconforming. He said that the Petitioners are seeking a number of variances to eliminate a current encroachment issues in which a portion of 30 River Ridge continues to encroach on 32 River Ridge despite prior efforts to correct that issue. He said that to balance the nonconforming frontages at 28 and 30 River Ridge where currently the frontage is 10 feet for 30 River Ridge and 45 feet for 28 River Ridge, they propose 24 feet of frontage for 30 River Ridge and 31 feet of frontage for 28 River Ridge. He said that the last variance would be to take a portion of the rear of 30 River Ridge and add it to 28 River Ridge for the purpose of coming back in the future to build a home within a buildable envelope at the rear of 28 River Ridge outside of the 200 foot River Front Protection Area.

Mr. Seegel confirmed that the existing structure at 28 River will be removed in the future. He said that the driveway leads down to the back. Mr. Himmelberger said that the dotted line shows the building envelope.

Mr. Himmelberger said that on the larger plan in the upper block the dotted lines are shown through the shed. He said that the proposal is to change the property line to make it conforming. He said that there is a building overhang over the property line noted on the plan. He said that moving the property line slightly by 1.29 feet they would eliminate that encroachment and in exchange for that make the rear shed conforming and adding some land to 32 River Ridge, which is the smallest of the parcels at 3,716 square feet. He said that the Planning Staff correctly pointed out that to do this will create new lots that are subject to Table 3, Section XIX of the Zoning Bylaw. He said that the Petitioners are seeking variances from requirements for lot size and frontage. He said that between 32 and 30 River Ridge they are seeking to remove an overhang encroachment and add land to 32 River Ridge. He said that the second request to change the frontages at 30 and 28 River Ridge to 31 and 24 feet instead of 10 and 45 feet. He said that will give more frontage to 30 and will reduce frontage for 28 River Ridge, albeit with the understanding that 31 foot frontage would only be used for the driveway that would go to the rear of 28 River Ridge. He said that by better balancing the two frontages they will remove some nonconformities. He said that 30 River Ridge currently does not have a conforming side yard setback which will now be 24 feet to the proposed lot line. He said that 28 River Ridge will be razed and removed and they will seek permission in another variance to remove a rear section of 30 River Ridge and add it to 28. He said

that 28 River Ridge will become a flag or pork chop lot. He said that a prior owner had come before the Board on numerous instances trying to do something with it, and given the grossly inadequate side yard setbacks and the fact that the lot was so narrow at 45 feet, that was an impossibility. He said that the Petitioners are looking to reconfigure 28 so as to bring the rear of 30, adding onto 28 with Zoning relief to be able to construct a single family dwelling within the building envelope and outside of the 200 foot buffer.

Mr. Becker said that after looking through the materials that were submitted, it appears that the Petitioners are asking for property conveyances. Mr. Himmelberger said that the Petitioners are seeking permission to reconfigure the property lines so that when they go to the Planning Board for ANR or subdivision, the Planning Board can approve it because the reconfigured lot lines will be legal. He said that it is predicate to going to Planning Board to get permission to record new plans at Registry of Deeds.

Mr. Seegel said that what is proposed makes a great deal of sense and will be good for the neighborhood. He said that rather than having the Board try to draft motions, Mr. Himmelberger should draft motions and send them to the Board. He said that the Board can vote approval at a business meeting.

Mr. Himmelberger submitted letters of support from neighbors at 34, 38, 39, 41, and 42 River Ridge.

Mr. Seegel asked about the 10 foot right of way that passes through the lots. Mr. Himmelberger said that it is an old MDC right of way that was the subject of a prior zoning action in which it was confirmed that the MDC had no interest in that parcel. He said that it dates back to 1994 and is contained within the original submittal to the Board. Mr. Seegel asked if anyone asked the MDC to vote to abandon the right of way.? Mr. Dejeu said that he had submitted a letter that stated that the MDC abandoned the right of way. Mr. Seegel said that the letter should be put on record. Mr. Dejeu said that he believes that it is. Mr. Seegel said that they might want to show that on the plans with a note that the right of way has been abandoned.

Mr. Becker said it would be helpful to get a schedule that describes the sequence of events to tie the pieces together.

Myriam Spiegel, 46 River Ridge, said that she has concerns and doubts that a fair judgment will not be deliverable today because Mr. Walter Adams is a resident on River Ridge. She said that he lives probably no more than 200 feet from the Petitioners. She said that Mr. Walter Adams is also a member of the Zoning Board. She said that there is a blatant conflict of interest and a high possibility of abuse of powers. She said that they believe that Mr. Walter Adams, who is part of this Board, has already drawn a conclusion and does not intend to be swayed by any arguments presented tonight. She said that it seems that there is a habit in River Ridge for certain residents to abuse Zoning variances concerning the laws of setback, open space and maximum footprint allowed per lot. She asked to kindly remind the ZBA that they hold the position that they have in order to make sure that the laws are respected and any kinds of undue influences is against the law and contrary to their duty towards the town and the community as a whole.

Ms. Spiegel said that there a lot of problems on River Ridge. She said that Mr. Walter Adams seems to favor people to break the law for asking for variances. Mr. Seegel said that Mr. Walter Adams is not sitting on this case. He said that Mr. Adams is an associate member of the Board. He said that the Board varies who sits on case to make sure that they do not have conflicts of interest. He said that Mr.

Adams is not telling this Board how to vote and he has not spoken to the Board about what he likes or does not like. He asked if Ms. Spiegel has a specific objection to what the Petitioners are proposing to do with their property.

Ms. Spiegel said that the case presented today is a perfect example of consequences of disregarding Zoning and Building Codes, including minimum setbacks, minimum open space and maximum footprint allowed per lot. She said that she welcomes some aspects of the requested variance today, as they reduce the mess and burden that crowded structures create. She said that the 30 River Ridge west side setback is increased from a nonconforming 11 feet to 21 feet, which leaves only one conforming setback on the east side. She said that they also welcome the one foot setback on the east side of that same house from zero to what looks like one foot. She said that, unfortunately, that is not enough but it is better than as it is now, as part of 30 River Ridge is currently on 32 River Ridge's land.

Ms. Spiegel said that regarding the other aspects of the requested variance, she cannot support it unless some clarifications and modifications are met. She said that she needs to know the square footage of the house that might be built at 28 River Ridge. She requested complete guarantee that the newly built house at 28 River Ridge will conform to all Zoning standard requirements with the exception of the 90 foot frontage. She said that it will have a rear setback of at least 20 feet, a side setback of at least 20 feet on both sides and a front setback of at least 30 feet and an open space of at least 15,230 square feet.

Ms. Spiegel said that the newly built house at 28 River Ridge must have adequate parking on the premises to accommodate the size of the new house plus at least two extra parking spaces on the premises for their guests. She said that the reason for the request is to try to remedy the parking chaos that plagues 28 to 38 River Ridge. She said that the past neighbors at 28 and 30 River Ridge and the current neighbor at 32 River Ridge fought between themselves because of parking spaces. She said that 36 River Ridge, the house of Mr. Walter Adams, does not have enough open space to accommodate a driveway. She said that part of Mr. Walter Adams driveway belongs to his neighbor at 38 River Ridge. She said that this weird situation caused the previous neighbor at 38 River Ridge to lose a potential buyer because Mr. Walter Adams' driveway encroaches on their land.

Ms. Spiegel said that for the ones that have children and grandchildren from 28 to 38 River Ridge, because the laws of setback, open space and maximum footprint allowed per lot have been butchered and grossly disrespected, they have almost no lawn for children to play, so the street has become their common playground. She said that they are often seen playing football, baseball and everything else. She said that it is dangerous.

Ms. Spiegel said that regarding 30 River Ridge, she would like assurance that the footprint will not be modified unless the house razed and a new one is built at the back of 30 River Ridge that respects all the laws regarding setback, open space and maximum footprint allowed for this lot, without any Zoning and building variances except for the 90 foot frontage.

Ms. Spiegel said that the houses from 28 to 40 River Ridge are close to each other like sardines because 28, 30, 32, 34 36 and 38 River Ridge have enlarged their houses by abusing Zoning requirements and seeking variances regarding setback and open space. She said that 42 River Ridge, her primary abutter, is at his minimum open space and its maximum footprint allowed by law and some of the setbacks are nonconforming. She said that part of 48 River Ridge's shed is on 38 River Ridge's land. She said that the narrow channels between the houses restrict first responders and firefighters, increasing the threat of spreading fire house to house, endangering her family, the people in those houses, and the forest that

abuts all the homes, the beautiful fauna and flora and the gorgeous hawks that fly so happily in the sky. She said that it is a gross negligence.

Ms. Spiegel said that variances exist only to be used sparingly and definitely not at will just for the sake of having a bigger house and because of connections to this Zoning Board, thinking that this is a done deal. She said that there is no such thing as a done deal when it concerns her family's safety.

Ms. Spiegel said that she is mainly for the petition because it remedies some exceptions that were allowed in the past.

Ben Spiegel, 46 River Ridge, said that there are open questions about the size of the building proposed at 28 River Ridge and what can be done to reduce the congestion in that corner of the street. He said that adjusting the frontage to give a little bit less to 28 and a bit more to 30 River Ridge and to reduce overlap of one building over another person's property are all benefits but they should be done only as required whereas currently most of the houses in that section of the street are on nonconforming lots that are far below 10,000 square feet and built above open space requirements.

Ms. Spiegel said that the reason that she and Mr. Spiegel are here today is because they have been told that it is a done deal and they are concerned about what is going to be built. Mr. Seegel said that nothing about this Board is a done deal. He said that all of this property was developed prior to Zoning in Wellesley. He said that there are other parts in Wellesley where similar or worse situations exist. He said that these homeowners still have a right to use their property in the way they think they would like it so long as it reasonably complies with Zoning. He said that the Board's job is to examine it and see if it makes sense. He said that the Board members have viewed this property and read all of the documents. He said that nothing voted on tonight will authorize construction of a house. He said that the Board is approving some real estate property lines being varied. He asked Ms. Spiegel to submit her presentation for the Board's record.

Ms. Spiegel said that it is heartbreaking to see the neighbors ganging up in that corner to enlarge their houses, disrespecting everything. Mr. Seegel and Mr. Becker said that this approval will not be to build or enlarge any houses.

Mr. Sheffield said that this Board will do what is appropriate under the Zoning bylaw to protect the neighborhood.

Mr. Himmelberger said that Ms. Spiegel's concerns are already addressed within the proposal. He said that she stated that she does not have a problem with correcting the encroachment at 32 and 30 River Ridge. He said that it is a good outcome to remove nonconformities and encroaching nonconformities. He said that balancing the frontage between 28 and 30 River Ridge will allow 30 River Ridge to have a better driveway in and more ability to park on lot 30. He said that it is not contemplated to build a house at the rear of 28 River Ridge and leave vehicles out on a corner.

Mr. Seegel said that this is about land, not about building houses.

Mr. Himmelberger said that, with the Board's permission, he will submit the requested motions and at the same time provide a clarification of what Zoning nonconformities are addressed or made better by virtue of the proposed motions. He said that within the ZBA decision 84-40, which was the second effort to obtain a variance, originally sought in 1982, where the Board expressed concern about the right of way. He read an excerpt from ZBA 84-40.

Mr. Sheffield asked if Mr. Himmelberger had seen copies of the memos that Joshua van Houten from DPW sent to the Board. Mr. Himmelberger said that he had not. Ms. Mahoney will send them to Mr. Himmelberger.

Mr. Becker asked if the sole purpose of Parcel 2, the 68 square foot triangle, to move the property line off the shed. Mr. Himmelberger said that it was more to offer consideration for 32 losing land, even though they will get more than what will be taken. He said that it is more of a quid pro quo.

Mr. Becker said that the general line of questioning relates to the motivation behind all of this. He said that some things will get better and some things will be worse but in the future perhaps some of the things that are worse may get better. Mr. Himmelberger said that the motivation for the wedge was the consideration to the Klingmeyers, who own 32 River Ridge, in order for them to convey the small strip to remove the encroachment from 30 River Ridge. He said that they asked for the wedge that has the benefit of making the shed no longer straddling the property line.

Mr. Seegel said that any house to be built at 28 River Ridge will have to come before the Board. Mr. Himmelberger said that the proposed building envelope indicates that it will only be built within the appropriate setbacks. He said that frontage on River Ridge will be insufficient.

Mr. Becker said that the best that they could do would be to add all of the parcels together and then divide by three. He said that they would end up with three lots that have sufficient area but still have other issues such as frontage. Mr. Himmelberger said that, of the three lots, two of them have more than sufficient area that will remain. He said that 32 River Ridge's area will increase slightly from 3,784 square feet. Mr. Becker questioned why the Petitioners should do anything at all if the result is a series of nonconformities. Mr. Himmelberger said that the number will be significantly reduced, just with the removal of the nonconforming structure at 28 River Ridge. He said that the house that will be sought to be placed at 28 River Ridge in the future will be fully conforming. He said that they are not simply rearranging nonconformities but eliminating some of them and in the process are able to construct a home at the rear of 28 that will be dimensionally compliant setback wise. He said that the existing house at 28 River Ridge is not dimensionally compliant and there is no way to make that a meaningful structure given the fact that it is a 45 foot wide lot at that point. He said that the overarching goal is to build a conforming structure at the rear of 28 that is fully conforming with the single exception of inadequate frontage. Mr. Sheffield said that it will be a larger house. He asked if anyone had looked at building at the rear of 30 River Ridge. Mr. Becker said that would be a challenge because of the Riverfront setback. Mr. Himmelberger said that the Riverfront setback does not allow for much at 30 River Ridge. He said that 30 has been improved over the years in its interior. He said that it is nowhere as deficient as 28 River Ridge is.

Mr. Seegel said the one of the variances is to create a new lot at 28 River Ridge with insufficient frontage. He questioned that since the other properties are already built and already have nonconforming frontages, is their frontage situation will actually be changing. Mr. Himmelberger said that they will add frontage to 30 River Ridge. Mr. Seegel said that they do not need a variance to add frontage. Mr. Himmelberger said that because they will be creating a new lot, they will require relief from Table 3.

Mr. Seegel read the Planning Board recommendation.

Mr. Himmelberger said that he can have the proposed motions to the Board by Tuesday for their review.

Mr. Becker moved and Mr. Sheffield seconded the motion to close the public hearing and schedule a public meeting for Friday, December 15, 2017 at 9:30 am. The Board voted unanimously to close the public hearing and schedule a public meeting for Friday, December 15, 2017 at 9:30 am.

ZBA 2017-93, SIOBHAN & PAUL DERRICKSON, 30 RIVERDALE ROAD

Presenting the case that the hearing were Siobhan and Paul Derrickson, the Petitioner, and Charles Malafaia, International Builders, Inc.

Mr. Derrickson said that it is a nonconforming lot with nonconforming front and left side yard setbacks. He said that the deck will have an 8 foot left side yard setback. He said that they have spoken with their neighbors and they are fine with the proposal.

Mr. Becker said that the lot size is nonconforming as well.

Mr. Malafaia said that the deck will be located 8.6 feet from the side property line.

Mr. Seegel confirmed that they will not be building above the hot tub.

Mr. Seegel read the Planning Board recommendation.

Ms. Derrickson that there will be a living ivy wall for screening.

Mr. Becker asked if there will be any lighting. Ms. Derrickson said that the lighting will just be inside the tub.

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

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

ZBA 2017-94, DAVID JONCAS, 15 ORDWAY ROAD

Presenting the case at the hearing were Kerri Byrne, Architect, David Joncas and Lauren Peters, the Petitioner. Ms. Byrne said that it is an existing nonconforming property with an 11 foot right side yard setback to the garage. She said that the proposal is for two additions, a two-story on the left and a one-story at the rear. She said that both additions will be conforming. She said that they will not be touching the existing nonconforming garage.

Mr. Becker said that because the house is attached to the garage, the house is nonconforming as well.

Mr. Seegel read the Planning Board recommendation.

Mr. Sheffield asked about the location of the air conditioning condensers. Ms. Byrne said that there are three existing air conditioning units where the new addition is going. She said that the units will be

moved to the rear of the house behind the addition. She said that the new location will meet the setback requirements.

Mr. Becker moved and Mr. Sheffield seconded the motion to grant a special permit and make a finding that the proposed structure shall not be substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood than the existing nonconforming structure. The Board voted unanimously to grant a special permit.

ZBA 2017-95, 285 GROVE STREET LLC, 285 GROVE STREET

Presenting the case at the hearing were David Himmelberger, Esq., David Silverstein, Copper Leaf Development, Paul Beaulieu, Field Resources, and Dustin Nolan, Architect.

Mr. Himmelberger said that the request is for a special permit to raze and reconstruct a conforming structure on a nonconforming lot that has an area of 31,395 square feet in a 40,000 square foot Single Residence District.

Mr. Himmelberger said that the proposed structure has a Total Living Area plus Garage (TLAG) of 6,520 square feet, which is below the 7,200 square foot threshold for lots in the SR30 and SR40 Districts. He said that it will be fully dimensionally compliant and is a tastefully designed home. He said that it will be within the building height limitations. He said that the Applicant has submitted the site plan showing the existing structure to be removed and the new structure to be constructed. He said that a landscape plan was attached to the submittal. He said that the exact TLAG is 6,512 square feet, which is well below the threshold. He said that the building height will be the same as the existing structure.

Mr. Seegel asked if Mr. Himmelberger had seen the letter from Joshua van Houten, Department of Public Works to the Board, dated December 4, 2017. Mr. Himmelberger said that he had not. Mr. Sheffield read the letter. Mr. Becker said that there is a plan attached to the letter but it is not clear if the connection exists or not. Mr. Beaulieu said that it does exist. He said that they were not able to find the manhole that is shown as part way down the driveway. He said that it may be paved over under the existing driveway. He said that they did find the catch basin and the four inch pipe out in the street. He said that they have been trying to schedule someone to video it. He said that they will not over burden it by adding any drainage to it but will sustain the existing function of it.

Mr. Becker said that he did not see a lot of information about what happens to the runoff from the new building. He said that, ordinarily in a residential area, this would not be much of an issue but this will be approximately twice the impervious area. Mr. Beaulieu distributed a drainage plan. Mr. Himmelberger said that the drainage plan shows a reduction in runoff. He said that the calculations in the lower left corner show a reduction in volume of runoff in the 2, 10 and 100 year storms. He said that it is the Applicant's intention to connect the utility and water from Grove Street. Mr. Seegel said that the plan must be stamped by the engineer. Mr. Seegel confirmed that they will be water and sewer from Grove Street. Mr. Beaulieu said that one of the things that they discussed with the neighbors and took into heavy consideration is that prior to construction this is a big issue. He said that they wanted to be sure that they do not exacerbate an existing problem but actually help take some of the water from that so that they are not putting water onto Longmeadow.

Mr. Seegel said that the Board received a letter from a neighbor that discussed the drainage problems on Longmeadow Road. He said that he did not see what will be provided to reduce runoff from the lot. Mr. Beaulieu said that everything shown in red on the drainage plan are things that will help to alleviate

stormwater runoff. He said that four systems will be added. He said that three of the systems will be standard Cultec Infiltration Systems that connect the downspouts so that all of the runoff that hits the roof will be dispersed to various parts of the lot so that it will not inundate any one portion of the lot. He said that the one of the big issues that happens currently is that water sheds from north to south. He said that since the driveway blocks that, they are creating a swale that leads to a rain garden or bio retention system, that has a fantastic ability to reduce surface runoff because its volumetric capacity is far surpasses the typical handling of a standard infiltration system. Mr. Becker asked where design point is. Mr. Beaulieu said that it is the entire property line. Mr. Becker said that normally there is a drainage that drains to a discharge point. Mr. Beaulieu said that he believes that would be at the driveway because that is the low point. He said that is spelled out in the Engineer's HydroCad that goes along with the plan.

Mr. Seegel asked what will be done to protect the property to the right on Grove Street because it is lower and looks to be a place where a lot of water could drain off to. Mr. Himmelberger said that everything off of the roof will go into the infiltration system. Mr. Beaulieu said that the two big benefits that that neighbor will see are removal of the driveway off Grove Street, which was a large impervious surface, and instead of having the lot slope towards that neighbor, it will be more level with a retaining wall at the property line. He said that there will be no impervious surface pushing water to the neighbor.

Mr. Seegel said that this is a big house. He said that if lot was 40,000 square feet, this would go for Large House Review. Mr. Himmelberger said that it would not go for LHR because the TLAG is only 6,500 square feet and the limit for a SR 30 or 40 is 7,200 square feet.

Mr. Seegel asked if there is a landscaping plan. Mr. Silverstein displayed a large format landscaping plan. Mr. Sheffield confirmed that the rain garden is along the property line of Richard and Joan Spillane's property. He questioned whether the drainage and landscape plans are coordinated.

Mr. Becker said that the neighbor's letter characterized the changes in grade. He asked what will be done to raise the existing grade to the proposed grade. Mr. Beaulieu said that the existing site has some high ground on Grove Street and a lower area toward Longmeadow. He said that since this will front on Longmeadow, as opposed to the current condition where the house fronts on Grove Street and has a walk out condition at the rear. He said that since they will be turning the structure around, they did not want the appearance of a large mass of building. He said that the ridge on the proposed house will be only slightly higher than the existing ridge so they will not have a mass of building facing Longmeadow. He said that there will be fill with a retaining wall creating a bit of a terrace so it does not appear to be a monstrosity of house.

Mr. Seegel said that the Spillanes live next door. He asked what will be done to screen the house from the Spillane's property. Mr. Silverstein said that there is significant screening along that property line already. Mr. Beaulieu said that the landscape plan shows the existing trees plus an additional six trees that are planted to screen the area that is currently void of trees. Mr. Silverstein said that there is a whole area that they will leave in its whole natural state. Mr. Seegel asked what trees will be taken down, where are they, what size are they and what will be put up. Mr. Beaulieu said that they will be taking down 199 dba inches of tree down which requires 150 inches of replacement, which is what they are proposing. He said that the ultimate goal is to bring this to a wooded state, much like it is. Mr. Silverstein said that a lot of the trees that are coming down were deemed by the arborist as hazardous. He said that according to the Town's Tree Bylaw, 100 inches need to be replaced. He said that they will be over that by almost fifty percent. He said that they made a big effort to put a lot of evergreen and

deciduous tree cover back, the vast majority of which will grow to be over story. Mr. Beaulieu said that they will plant six trees near the rain garden area where there are currently no trees.

Mr. Seegel confirmed that there is no possibility of water flow from this property to the Spillane property. Mr. Beaulieu said that this property is below the Spillane property.

Mr. Silverstein displayed a drawing that shows the relation of this house to the Spillane property. He displayed pictures that show significant screening along the property line.

Mr. Silverstein submitted a Construction Management Plan (CMP).

Mr. Himmelberger said that they are endorsing the parking concerns that were addressed in Mr. Spillane's letter. He said that they intend to take traffic off of Grove Street, as noted in the plan. He said that they would be happy to put up a sign on Longmeadow that says that there shall be no construction traffic for 45 Longmeadow. Mr. Seegel said that all construction traffic must come up Grove Street. Mr. Himmelberger said that the only qualification that they seek is that there is going to come a time when they have to build the driveway and they will have to close off Grove Street.

Mr. Seegel asked if there will be a wheel wash for coming and going. Mr. Becker said that it is a Water Supply Protection District and they should not be bringing stuff in or putting stuff on the street that is not acceptable. Mr. Himmelberger said that on the second page of the CMP there is reference to the wheel wash. He said that on Page 3, the CMP talks about large truck traffic and access to the site.

Mr. Himmelberger said that during construction the property will continue to be known as 285 Grove Street, so vendors and contractors coming to the site will look for the property on Grove Street, not Longmeadow.

Mr. Seegel said that there appears to be enough room on the site for the workers to park on site. Mr. Beaulieu said that there is a very large U-shaped driveway. Mr. Seegel asked if the work men will enter from Longmeadow Road. Mr. Silverstein said that the plan is to have a temporary crushed stone parking pad on Grove Street. He said that there will be a sign at the end of the driveway on Longmeadow that says that there shall be no construction parking on Longmeadow and anyone who is parked there will be towed. He said that they will have a secondary temporary parking pad on the Longmeadow side so that if there is unforeseen overflow parking, there is the opportunity for workers to park on a secondary parking pad on the property. He said that would not include any large trucks. He said that he has spoken at length with Mr. Spillane about this and is sensitive to it. He said that Longmeadow is a narrow road.

Mr. Seegel asked about snow removal in the winter. Mr. Silverstein said that he contracts with a gentleman in town who clears his projects ongoing. He said that they will clear the parking areas and the driveway. He said that they will keep the paved U-shape driveway on Grove Street for as long as possible.

Mr. Sheffield said that the property does not have enough frontage on Longmeadow. Mr. Himmelberger said that there is no Police, Selectmen or Zoning requirement an address may only be located on the frontage that is adequate, so long as the lot itself does have adequate frontage as this does on Grove Street. Mr. Silverstein said that he spoke with the Selectmen's Office, who pointed him to the Fire Department, who had no issue with changing the frontage. He said that they wanted a post at the end of

the driveway at 45 Longmeadow that indicated the address. Mr. Himmelberger said that the Assessor already calls the property 45 Longmeadow.

Mr. Seegel said that they may have to sweep Grove Street. Mr. Himmelberger said that the CMP discusses that. Mr. Silverstein said that traditionally the biggest time when it is an issue is early on in the project during excavation for the foundation.

Mr. Sheffield said that the siting of the house presents a corner to the neighbors and they do not see the entire length of the façade, which has the benefit of making it appear smaller than it is.

Catherine Johnson, Planning Board, said that the Planning Board just approved a Large House Review directly across the street at 276 Grove Street with 12,000 square feet of living space. She said that they will be taking down a lot of trees and bringing in a new driveway. She said that the Applicant may be able to share a street sweeper to keep Grove Street clear.

Mr. Seegel read the Planning Board recommendation.

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

Mr. Becker moved and Mr. Sheffield seconded the motion to make a finding that the proposed structure shall not be substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood than the existing nonconforming structure and to grant a special permit subject to the conditions that construction shall be in accordance with the CMP, drainage shall be in accordance with the drainage plan, landscaping shall be in accordance with the landscaping plan, and all utilities shall come in from Grove Street. The Board voted unanimously to grant a special permit.

ZBA 2017- 97, SCOTT & KIM SNAPPER, 38 HILLSIDE AVENUE

As there was no one present at the public hearing, the petition was continued to February 1, 2018.

ZBA 2017-98, WELLESLEY COLLEGE, 106 CENTRAL STREET

Presenting the case at the hearing was Justin Mosca, VHB. Also present were Michelle Maheu, Wellesley College, Carl Franceschi, DRA Architects, and Dave Conway, Nitsch Engineering.

Mr. Mosca said that Site Plan Approval for the temporary trailers is one of the phases in the modernization of the Science Center at the College. He said that this will be swing space for the other components that will happen. He said that there will be some renovation work and some new construction. He said that the temporary facilities are where classrooms, office and laboratories will be located. He said that it is design build modular construction. He said that the lease for the trailers is three years. He said that there will be two phases. He said that the footprint of the building will stay the same in the second phase once a portion of the Science Center Project is completed and the program gets moved back. He said that it will be all interior renovation after that.

Mr. Mosca displayed the location of the project. He said that it will not be visible from any public streets.

Mr. Mosca said that there is some renovation that will be going on in the L & E Wing that is primarily interior renovation but there is going to be some work that will disturb more than 5,000 square feet. He

said that the Global Flora Greenhouse contains the worldwide collection that the College has. He said that there will be a new greenhouse for that. He said that the main project with Sage Hall is slated for demolition and expansion of the Science Center on that side because that hall is outdated. He said that there will be some minor work up at the Observatory but that will just involve utility runs.

Mr. Mosca said that the project before the Board is to allow for swing space for a project that will be coming before the Board at a later date. He said that the trailers are design build pods so they do not have all of the mechanicals or foundation information yet. He said that part of this request is that it be granted with provision that the Building Inspector will have the authority to approve the building plans. He said that all of the stairs and ramps are site built. He said that modular sit above the grade by approximately four feet. He said that the parking lot where they will be installed will remain underneath. He said that the lot will get re-established when the trailers are removed.

Mr. Seegel asked about sewer and water connections. Mr. Mosca said that a plan was submitted that shows that.

Mr. Mosca said that there will be minimal impact to existing vegetation in the parking lot. He said that the project will conform to the existing topography. He said that the pods can be set at different elevations and connections made between them.

Mr. Mosca said that sewer connections will run along the west side of the pods. He said that the connections will be determined based on the design build and where they will need plumbing coming out of the building. He said that they connect to an existing on campus collection system. He said that there is an existing water connection on the north side that will connect into the building. He said that there is a 36 inch perforated pipe for stormwater. He said that it will offset temporary impervious surface that will become pervious once the trailers come out.

Mr. Mosca said that there will be walkway connections to existing College walkways. He said that there will be ramps to connect the walkways accessibly into the pods. He said that will be providing some accessible space by the trailers to accommodate handicapped parking. He said that the displaced parking from the lot was reviewed by the Board of Selectmen as part of the PSI submittal. He said that parking will be temporarily redistributed throughout the campus. He said that Campus Parking will be in charge of permits for parking. He said that a lot of the parking will probably be transferred to the parking garage and on temporarily re-stripped tennis courts.

Mr. Mosca said that post construction, the same contractor will remove the trailers and restore the lot.

Mr. Mosca said that they received comments from the Department of Public Works (DPW) about a week ago. He said that they addressed DPW's comments. He said that they got a revised design build footprint from the contractor. He said that the original framework has been updated to a design build footprint by the contractor.

Mr. Mosca said that the comments from DPW were minor. He said that VHB submitted a response to comments memo. He said that the contractor realigned the pods to make them more parallel because they are easier to construct that way. He said that the south end was brought up to be entirely within the parking lot limit. He said that they will remove some trees to accommodate that. He said that 19 trees were originally scheduled to be removed but that number has been reduced to 7. He said that there will be a small retaining wall around a corner so as to not disturb utilities.

Mr. Sheffield confirmed that the College has a chemical removal contractor for the existing laboratories. He asked how that will be handled in the temporary space. Ms. Maheu said that the College will continue to have the contractor remove hazardous materials. She said that will be part of the loading dock function. Mr. Mosca said that hazardous materials will be stored in locked storage with access only by trained people. He said that the College does not store large quantities of hazardous materials in the classrooms. Mr. Sheffield confirmed that the contractors pick up sealed containers of hazardous materials. Ms. Maheu said that it will be the same process that they use now but will be consolidated and downsized a bit

Mr. Becker said that, in thinking about most of the project's impacts such as noise, they are not as much of a concern because the project is located in the middle of the College's campus. He said that what does have an impact is the fact that this project is located in a Water Supply Protection District (WSPD) where there are unique requirements for facilities for hazmat, wastes, storage and handling. He said that he did not see a lot in the package that talked about that. He said that where one can simply say that they are moving things from the Science Center into this space, it was not explained how it would be done. He said that the Board would be concerned about the gravel around the perforated pipe and things being brought in that are not allowed in the WSPD. He said that there was no information submitted about refueling construction vehicles.

Mr. Conway said that the type of construction for this project is not heavy. He said that the parking lot will not be disturbed and there will not be large areas of uncovered earth. He said that the foundations will get drilled in, and trailers will arrive on trucks and be assembled and blocked together. He said that the whole assembly will be put together after two weeks. He said that stone around the 36 inch infiltration pipe is not as needed as it once was because of the change in layout. He said that the project will be located over the existing parking lot. He said that the stone will be clean double washed crushed stone. He said that the only other digging will be for the sewer line, and short water connections. He said that a good deal of the electrical lines will be pole mounted because they are only going to be there for a couple of years. He said that Wellesley MLP will put in the poles and do some of the power work.

Mr. Becker asked about the fire protection road and turn around on the west side. Mr. Conway said that will be paved.

Mr. Conway said that the project is more of an assembly rather than construction. He said that there are a couple of special parts to the project, the chemical storage being one of them. He said that the assembly itself is fairly light construction.

Mr. Mosca said that the only site work for the turnaround is connecting the apron. He said that they are still trying to figure out the volume of chemicals that will be stored. He said that if it reaches a certain point it will require secondary containment. He said that will be based on volumes. Mr. Becker said that because there are incomplete technical solutions, it is hard for the Board to get the conditions right. He said that if the Board understands what the plan is, the Board can get the right things in place. Mr. Mosca said that the College has staff that is dedicated to environmental health and safety. He said that they will drive the process to make sure that the project is in full compliance.

Mr. Becker said that he did not see in the CMP how the construction traffic will get to the site. Mr. Conway said that when the CMP was prepared the contractor had not been selected yet. He said that the contractor will be Triumph and they have facilities in Littleton, MA. He said that they will work directly with the Police Department on how to approach the site. He said that he worked with Triumph

on a similar project in Needham. Mr. Franceschi said that they will not be oversized vehicles. He said that Turner Construction is the contractor for the larger construction project on campus. He said that their construction travel route is down Weston Road to the College Road entrance off of Washington Street. Mr. Conway said that he would guess that Triumph will come down Route 27 to Route 135.

Mr. Seegel said that the Board needs more information. He said that the Board is not able to properly write up a site plan approval with conditions.

Mr. Becker said that Weston Road, westbound from Route 135 to Route 9 is heavily congested. He said that putting 60 foot long modules on there will force the line of traffic back even further. Mr. Conway said that his guess is that the modules will be coming from the west on Route 135.

Mr. Seegel said that the hearing should be continued so that the Board can get enough information. He asked about the timeframe for the temporary trailers. Mr. Mosca said that it is extremely quick. He said that the College is looking to submit a building permit application in January.

Mr. Becker said that the Board is interested in knowing the site impacts, such as number of workers, how long will they be there, where will they park, and types of vehicles. He said that the other considerations concern things that relate to the WSPD including specs on the materials and control of what is happening in the modules in terms of hazmats. He said that the Board has not seen anything that addresses those issues. He said that the Board is concerned about when the trailers will arrive in Wellesley and how they will get to the site.

Mr. Mosca asked if the construction traffic route can be conditional on working it out with the Police Department. Mr. Becker said that it is part of Site Plan Approval and the Board has to look at it.

Mr. Mosca said that they can get the information to the Board by early next week. Mr. Seegel said that the Board will meet on Friday morning, December 15, 2017. He said that Mr. Becker prepared a set of questions that the Board will share with the Applicant.

Mr. Sheffield said that it is important to understand the safety impacts. Mr. Becker said that it is also important to understand the traffic impacts.

Mr. Sheffield said that there will not be much change to the hardscape here. Mr. Conway said that the plan was revised to move the modules totally onto the parking lot rather than overhanging landscaping, so the stormwater mitigation design will over compensate for runoff.

Mr. Becker moved and Mr. Sheffield seconded the motion to continue the Site Plan Approval to Friday, December 15, 2017. The Board voted unanimously to continue the hearing.