

Robert Broder, AIA  
Robert Skolnick  
Ingrid Carls  
Helen Robertson  
Johnathan Law

Howard Raley, AIA, *alternate*  
Sheila Dinsmoor, *alternate*



Town Hall  
525 Washington Street  
Wellesley, MA. 02482  
Tel. (781) 431-1019 ext. 2230  
Fax (781) 237-6495

Erin L. Heacock, AICP, *Planner*  
eheacock@wellesleyma.gov

**REDEVELOPMENT OF 576 WASHINGTON STREET AND 53 GROVE STREET**

**AMENDED PROJECT OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACT  
AMENDED SITE PLAN APPROVAL  
DRB 17-07M**

**WELLESLEY SQUARE COMMERCIAL DISTRICT DENSITY SPECIAL PERMIT  
DRB 13-34M**

**JULY 1, 2013**

The Board hereby certifies that the following is a complete record of the Design Review process regarding the application by Mr. Jordan Warshaw, HRV Development, LLC, for Design Review of the redevelopment of 576 Washington Street and 53 Grove Street in Wellesley Square, the former location of the Wellesley Inn.

The Wellesley Inn Redevelopment project restarts a long delayed project in the Wellesley Square Commercial District. The previous approvals for the Wellesley Inn Redevelopment project are still in effect due to the Permit Extension Act. The applicant approached the Planning Board in late 2012 to ask the Planning Board to consider a reduction in the family unit to lot size of 2,500 square feet to 1,800 square feet in the Wellesley Square Commercial District. The Planning Board agreed to consider this density increase via a special permit as it would also support their goal of increasing housing in Wellesley Square. A motion was presented at the 2013 Annual Town Meeting and was passed by Town Meeting to allow the increase in density as described above.

At this time, a request is made of the DRB to recommend for approval a new design of the buildings on site. Specifically, a DRB recommendation is requested for amended site plan approval and for the new special permit for the density increase in the Wellesley Square Commercial District.

The proposed modified project does not include any material change to the use, site layout, or massing depicted in the originally approved plans. However, there are some interior and exterior modifications to the Washington Building and the Grove Building.

A reduction of the average size of the units in the Washington Building from 19 units averaging 2,500 square feet to 25 units averaging 1,900 square feet is proposed. Exterior changes to the Washington Building include different façade materials, a change to the layout of windows and doors due to the change in unit plans, a change to exterior decks and railings due to the change in unit plans, a change to the roof line, direct sidewalk access to the retail space on Washington Street, and retaining the granite stone wall along Grove Street.

The original approvals included the renovation of the cottage at 53 Grove Street for 2 affordable units. The current proposal includes the removal of the cottage and the construction of a new building which would include the 5 required affordable units. An alternative plan put forth by the applicant retains the cottage at 53 Grove Street, which after renovations would house 2 affordable units, and construction of a third building on the site behind the existing cottage to house 3 affordable units.

The submitted complete application includes the following document and plans:

- Application for Design Review
- Wellesley Inn Site Redevelopment DRB Submission, Prepared by Childs Bertman Tseckares, Inc, dated May 10, 2013
  - 2006 Aerial Site Plan Approved
  - 2013 Aerial Site Plan Proposed
  - Site Plan Rendering, 2006 Approved Plan
  - Site Plan Rendering, 2013 Proposed
  - Site Grading Plan, 2013 Proposed
  - Site Materials Plan, 2013 Proposed
  - Site Planting Plan, 2013 Proposed
  - 2006 Approved Basement Floor Electrical Plan (2013 Unchanged)
  - 2006 Approved First Floor Electrical Plan (2013 Unchanged)
  - 2013 Revised Basement Plan
  - 2013 Revised Ground Floor Plan
  - 2013 Revised Second Floor Plan
  - 2013 Revised Third Floor Plan
  - 2013 Revised Fourth Floor Plan
  - 2006 Approved Washington Street Elevation
  - 2006 Approved Grove Street Elevation
  - 2013 Elevation Studies Washington Street (Sheet 1)
  - 2013 Elevation Studies Washington Street (Sheet 2)
  - 2013 Elevation Studies Washington Street (Sheet 3)
  - 2013 Elevation Studies Washington Street (Sheet 4)
  - 2013 Proposed Washington Street Elevation
  - 2013 Proposed Grove Street Elevation
  - Surrounding Context – Washington Street
  - Surrounding Context – Washington and Church Streets
  - Surrounding Context – Grove Street
  - Existing Structures on Site
  - Precedents
  - 53 Grove Street Proposed Elevation
  - 53 Grove Street Rear and Left Side Elevation
- Wellesley Inn Site Redevelopment DRB Submission – Supplement 1, 53 Grove Alternate (2 Building) Plan, Prepared by Childs Bertman Tseckares, Inc, dated May 10, 2013
  - 53 Grove Alternate (2 Building) Plan
  - Alternate 53 Grove Site Plan Rendering
  - Alternate 53 Grove Site Grading Plan
  - Alternate 53 Grove Site Materials Plan
  - Alternate 53 Grove Site Planting Plan
  - Alternate 53 Grove Elevation
  - 53 Grove Alternate Proposed Elevation
  - 53 Grove Alternate Rear and Left Side Elevation

The following is a complete record of the DRB discussion.

**May 22, 2013**

Jordan Warshaw, applicant, introduced the redevelopment project at 576 Washington Street and 53 Grove Street, the location of the former Wellesley Inn. Mr. Warshaw explained that there are three major changes since the original redevelopment plan was approved in the mid-2000s. A redesign transitioned

the proposed buildings from a brick façade to a white clapboard façade. A change to the affordable housing program on site is part of the new proposal. Originally, only two of the required 6 affordable housing units were proposed on site and the other four were at other locations. Mr. Warshaw proposes five affordable housing units on site in a single building and a payment-in-lieu for the sixth unit. Mr. Warshaw also explained a two building alternative for the required affordable housing. The two building alternative was conceived through discussions with the Wellesley Historical Commission in order to save the existing cottage located at 53 Grove Street. For the two building alternative to work, three conditions must be satisfied: the Wellesley Housing Development Corporation must agree to a downsize of the units, there needs to be State Building Code relief relative to the lot line setback, and Community Preservation Act funding must be approved by the Wellesley Community Preservation Committee and Town Meeting. Finally, the third major change is the increase in the number of units.

Mr. Warshaw requests the DRB recommend approval of the proposed project with a single building housing five affordable housing units unless the three conditions for the two building solution described are satisfied.

Mr. Warshaw introduced the consultant team for the project including David Nagahiro and Scott Booth of Childs Bertman Tseckares, Inc Architects (CBT) and Bob Corning of Stantec.

Mr. Nagahiro described the orientation of the site and the topography change from Washington Street to Grove Street. The front of the Washington Building is oriented to the ceremonial axis on Church Street. Mr. Nagahiro explained that the same considerations as the original proposal were considered. The materiality of the proposed buildings is different, but the massing is the same as previously proposed.

Mr. Corning described the site plans changes. The location of the Grove Building is different from the original proposal due to putting the five affordable housing units on site. Mr. Corning noted that a modular block retaining wall along Grove Street originally proposed was eliminated from the current proposal. The existing stone wall along Grove Street will be retained and rehabilitated. Mr. Corning explained that the Washington Building was lowered 2 feet to allow entrance into the retail stores from grade.

Mr. Nagahiro noted that the current proposal for the Washington Building has a similar alignment to the original proposal. On Grove Street, there is an additional retail space and the entrance to the underground garage. Some parking spaces would be tandem spaces. Retail is at the sidewalk grade on Grove Street and Washington Street.

Mr. Nagahiro stated that the materials will be rusticated clapboard or stone materials. The top of the building is modulated. The retail locations have glass storefronts. The entrance to the residential portion is setback from the street.

Mr. Raley stated that he prefers more detail in the materials rather than an either/or statement from applicants.

Mr. Warshaw stated that a firm decision on materials has not been made yet. Mr. Warshaw stated that he does not want a stripy building with different materials at each floor.

Mr. Nagahiro stated that the top floor would have a different pattern. The same material would be used but would have a different modulation.

Mr. Nagahiro stated that the windows are inset to create a shadow.

Mr. Raley stated that he understands that there is an elevation change along Washington Street and that elevation change is incorporated into the streetscape along Washington Street, but Mr. Raley stated he feels that continuity of the retail space is lost.

Mr. Warshaw stated that he wants to have walk-in retail. If a person cannot walk into a retail storefront, it is believed that the retail location is non-viable. It also is not ADA accessible.

Mr. Raley noted that he would prefer to carry the retail storefront look (what can be seen on the right side of the Washington Building) be carried across the whole building along Washington Street.

Mr. Warshaw stated he did not have a preference regarding keeping or eliminating the columns.

Mr. Raley noted that he understands the history and why the columns are incorporated, but he also knows they are faux.

Mr. Nagahiro explained that the columns have a square shape and there is a terrace underneath. Mr. Law asked whether the terrace would be usable space. It would be.

Mr. Law asked whether the storefront behind the columns would be a single storefront. Mr. Warshaw stated that it would be a single storefront. The other retail space could be subdivided, but the intention with the single space was to bring in a single boutique or a café.

Mr. Law stated he feels the current design is a step forward from the previous design. He stated that the columns give the building a sense of being important. He agreed with Mr. Raley's preference to carry the storefront aesthetic across the Washington Building on the first floor.

Mr. Law commented on the proposed hardscape. He notes that stone will be used in the landscaped courtyard but concrete will be used at the front of the buildings. Mr. Law prefers a better material than concrete be used in the patio in front of the retail storefront. Mr. Law also commented that the planters are a good addition to the front and the addition of some ornamental trees would be better.

Mr. Raley questioned the location of gutters and down spouts. Mr. Booth stated that there are gutters and down spouts proposed to carry water off of terraces and decks and will be internal so that they are hidden.

Ms. Carls commented on the roof elements. She wonders if any of the elements would be visible from adjacent streets. Mr. Nagahiro stated with the exception of the elevator override, nothing would be visible. Further the elevator override has been reduced in height in order to reduce its visibility. Ms. Carls asked if any of the roof elements would be visible from Grove Street. Mr. Law added that the courtyard would be landscaped with trees which may help to obscure the view of any roof elements.

Ms. Carls thought that the columns are traditional. She thought that they could be better integrated with the foundation. Mr. Nagahiro indicated that they could review the columns. Mr. Booth stated that the columns are a sensitive issue.

Mr. Law asked about consideration for the outdoor space. He suggested a seat wall. Mr. Booth noted the planters are granite. Ms. Carls asked if the planters would be lawn or garden. Mr. Warshaw stated the intention is to plant annuals which would turn over with the season. Mr. Warshaw stated that there would be seating in that area if the retail space is leased to a small café.

Mr. Broder asked whether the change in façade material would be subtle. Mr. Nagahiro stated that the materiality would be the same in a different modulation. Mr. Broder opined there is a different expression of retail from the left and right side. Mr. Nagahiro stated that they could continue the glass storefront and awnings across the retail level.

Ms. Carls asked what type of restaurant would be located in the storefront. Mr. Warshaw stated that he would like to be particular about the type of restaurant. The wrong type of restaurant may drive away potential residents. Mr. Warshaw is targeting a small chef-owned restaurant or café which serves

primarily breakfast and lunch. Ms. Carls inquired about parking for restaurant patrons. Mr. Warshaw noted that he is obligated to a \$250,000 contribution to the Wellesley parking fund, which would be used by the Town to upgrade existing public parking in Wellesley.

Mr. Broder endorsed the project. He stated it is a vast improvement from the previous proposal. The Washington Building in particular is an integrated structure. He agreed with the applicant that the columns pose an interesting dilemma.

Ms. Carls agreed with Mr. Broder. She stated that the articulation of the upper stories is interesting.

Ms. Carls inquired whether any sustainability elements were integrated into the project or whether the applicant would seek LEED certification. Mr. Warshaw stated that it is unlikely he will seek LEED certification for the project. However, he would expect that the project could have enough points to be LEED certifiable or better, likely a Silver rating. Mr. Nagahiro stated that current building code also requires numerous efficiencies and systems.

Mr. Nagahiro continued his presentation of the proposed project with the Grove Street elevation. From Grove Street, the landscaped courtyard will be visible. There is also another retail storefront. Mr. Nagahiro stated that the retail location would also receive the same storefront treatment that the Washington Street retail storefronts would receive. Clapboard would be used above the retail level.

Mr. Broder asked about the garage door. Mr. Booth stated that the garage door is set back about a car and a half back.

Mr. Raley asked about the railings seen on the Washington Building. Mr. Warshaw stated that the railings would be a picketed style railing. Mr. Warshaw stated that his preference is to not do the glass style railings. Mr. Raley asked if the railings protect the faux balconies. They do.

Mr. Law inquired why an awning is not proposed over the garage door. Mr. Booth stated that it may cause confusion with retail space. Mr. Nagahiro stated that pedestrians have access to the residences through alleys on either side of the Washington Building. Mr. Booth stated that the garage is alarmed so that pedestrians are aware of vehicles entering or exiting the garage.

Mr. Law stated he would like to see healthy sized trees installed in the courtyard. He recommends that the applicants install the size tree shown on the landscaping plan.

Ms. Carls asked whether the courtyard is private. It is open to all residents, but not the general public.

Mr. Nagahiro presented the two building alternate for the affordable housing units. In the alternate plan, the existing cottage would be moved closer to the street and a second building would be constructed behind the cottage.

Mr. Law thought that the grade behind the second building appears to be steep. Mr. Corning stated that the slope is 2:1.

Mr. Warshaw indicated that the 2 building solution is constrained. An easement from Wellesley Green provides access to the buildings. An exterior stair on the renovated cottage could be moved inside with the removal of a bedroom approved by the Wellesley Housing Development Corporation. State Building Code relief is needed to site the building on the lot line.

Mr. Warshaw stated that the 2 building alternate would have the same windows and materiality as the Washington Building. He indicated that the second building should be connected to the existing cottage.

Mr. Broder asked what the view is from the Grove Buildings. Mr. Warshaw stated that the view is of the Wellesley Green parking lot and some vegetation.

Mr. Law stated concerns about the fifteen foot drive aisle. He stated maneuverability will be difficult. Mr. Corning stated that the parking lot is tight. Mr. Corning stated that 30 percent of the spaces, as allowed by the Zoning Bylaw, are for compact cars. Six of the nine spaces are full size.

Ms. Heacock asked whether residents of the affordable units have access to or through the garage. Mr. Warshaw stated no.

Mr. Broder asked about the tandem parking spaces in the garage. Mr. Warshaw stated that the tandem spaces would only be for a single unit to avoid conflicts.

Mr. Broder recognized David Wright, chairman of the Wellesley Historical Commission, who provided a short presentation on the history of the existing cottage at 53 Grove Street.

Mr. Wright stated that the Wellesley Historical Commission is in favor of the applicant's alternate plan to preserve the cottage. Mr. Wright referred to sections of the Zoning Bylaw including Section XXII. *Design Review, Part C. Design Criteria*, Paragraph 5, and Section XVIII. *Area Regulations, C. Ratio of Families to Lot Area*, Paragraph 3, which specifically relate to historical, cultural, and traditional uses.

Mr. Wright described the Beebe House as having the three major elements (persons, architecture, and location) that contribute to its historic status. Two of the three previous owners have contributed to education in Wellesley: Captain Beebe, who the house is named for, contributed to Wellesley College and Ms. Cooke contributed to Dana Hall School. The architecture is a good example of typical New England design common in the 1870s. The two additions to the cottage are not as important. The location is a rare survivor of a residential Wellesley Square. The building housing the Turnabout Shoppe is the other example.

Mr. Wright explained that every effort to ensure the preservation and rehabilitation of the cottage should be taken. He believes that incorporation of the cottage into the redevelopment plan is achievable as is satisfying the three criteria explained by Mr. Warshaw.

Mr. Wright stated that the preservation and rehabilitation of the cottage meets or is consistent with the Heritage design criterion. He also stated that it will enhance the pedestrian experience consistent with the criteria to approve the new special permit for increased density in Wellesley Square.

Mr. Raley stated that he appreciates the efforts of the Historical Commission.

Mr. Law agrees with the Historical Commission that the cottage should be kept.

Ms. Carls stated that the two building solution offered by Mr. Warshaw is a good solution.

Mr. Wright asked Mr. Leuth to give some insight into the Community Preservation Committee, which would have to approve the use of Community Preservation Act money for the project and would also have to request approval from Town Meeting for the use of the funding. Mr. Leuth believes that the chances for the funding to be approved are good based on past approvals. He stated that the current cost estimate is within an acceptable range and would most likely be accepted. He stated that the type of project is consistent with the Community Preservation Committee's mission.

Mr. Raley asked how extensive a renovation would be required. Mr. Warshaw indicated it would be a gut renovation.

Mr. Raley asked if wood clapboard would be used. Mr. Booth stated it would be restored.

Ms. Carls inquired about the cost to the Community Preservation Committee. Mr. Warshaw stated the full cost for renovation would be borne entirely by the Community Preservation Committee. Mr. Warshaw stated the differential between the two alternate plans is the cost to the Community Preservation Committee.

Mr. Raley asked whether the rear building would have stone as part of the façade. Mr. Booth indicated it is unlikely as the design is to complement the existing cottage.

Mr. Law inquired if there is an accessible unit. Mr. Warshaw stated that he is working with the Housing Development Corporation to sort out the program for the units. The cottage cannot become accessible without an exterior lift, so it is likely one of the first floor units at the rear building would be accessible.

Mr. Broder asked if photovoltaic panels were considered to reduce utility costs. Mr. Warshaw stated that there is one south facing roof. He also stated that there is a conflict between aesthetics and function. Ms. Carls agreed that if it is possible, it is a good idea. Mr. Wright could not offer a comment from the Historical Commission at this time.

Ms. Carls asked about the plan for waste removal. Trash removal is offered.

Mr. Broder expressed concern about the alternate plan. He stated that the single building plan would be quicker to construct. Mr. Warshaw stated that either the single building or the alternate plan would take five to six months for construction. The construction of the Washington Building would take fourteen months. There is some leeway in the construction schedule to work out the details.

Mr. Wright stated that the road does not have to end if Community Preservation Committee funding is not approved. He stated the Historical Commission is researching other grant opportunities.

Mr. Warshaw stated that he will likely request to decouple the Certificate of Occupancy for the buildings so that the project can continue to move along.

Mr. Broder stated that the renovation plan should maintain the original detailing of the wood clapboard. It appears that the clapboard is narrow, approximately 4 inches. This should be duplicated in the restoration. Research on other details is important so that the renovation is correct. It will be tough to bring the cottage to livable standards.

Mr. Broder invited any members of the public in attendance to speak.

Ms. Fragasso, 166 Oakland Street, stated that she is impressed by the collaboration. She appreciates the historic landmarks and homes in Wellesley and is a community element she seeks out. Ms. Fragasso stated that keeping diversity is important to foster the appreciation for new and old. It adds charm and vitality. Ms. Fragasso stated she thinks there is support in the community for the alternate plan.

### **Recommendation**

The first three motions relate to the amended Project of Significant Impact and amended Site Plan Approval.

Mr. Broder moved to recommend approval of the Washington Building subject to the following conditions:

1. The DRB should be involved in the mock up process for the building.
2. The design of the columns should be refined during the mock up process including consideration of a contemporary base detail.
3. Carry stone hardscape materials to the front of the building instead of concrete.

4. Flank plaza with smaller trees in the raised planters or continue the street trees along Washington Street.
5. Consider the use of seat walls.
6. Continue the storefront treatment along the length of the Washington Building including glass storefronts and awnings.
7. Use interior roof drains and gutters.

Mr. Law seconded Mr. Broder's motion. The motion passed unanimously (4-0).

Mr. Broder moved to recommend approval of the Grove Building, a single building housing five affordable housing units, unless the three conditions for the alternate two building solution are satisfied including: the Wellesley Housing Development Corporation must agree to a downsize of the units, there needs to be building code relief to position the rear building as proposed, and Community Preservation Act funding must be approved by the Wellesley Community Preservation Committee and Wellesley Town Meeting. Mr. Law seconded Mr. Broder's motion. The motion passed unanimously (4-0).

If three conditions for the alternate two building solution are satisfied, Mr. Raley moved to recommend approval of the alternate two building solution retaining the Beebe Cottage subject to the following conditions:

1. The DRB will review the exposure of the clapboard siding of the two buildings with respect to the exposure on the existing Beebe Cottage.
2. The renovation will be historically accurate.

Mr. Broder seconded Mr. Raley's motion. The motion passed unanimously (4-0).

The final motion recommends approval of the project under the new Wellesley Square Commercial District Density Special Permit. The Planning Board grants this special permit and requests a favorable report of the DRB as criterion for approval.

Mr. Law moved to recommend approval of the redevelopment of the former Wellesley Inn site as the project is consistent with the design criteria, will improve building facades enhancing the pedestrian experience, and will contribute toward the history and vitality of Wellesley Square. Mr. Broder seconded Mr. Law's motion. The motion passed unanimously (4-0).



.....  
Robert A. Broder, AIA, Chairman



.....  
Date